THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXXXVII, No. 3 . SEPTEMBER, 1957

CONTENTS

The Record of an American Priest: Michael Earls, S. J. 1873-1937. Part I. . . . . *William L. Lucey, S.J.* 145

The Problem of Periodic Continence . . . *John A. Goodwine* 156

"Our Tainted Nature's Solitary Boast" *Edgar Schmiedler, O.S.B.* 168

The Encyclical *Pascendi* and the Modernist Frame of Mind *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 176

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R., and David Granfield, O.S.B.

The Proximate Matter of Baptism 192

The Nun's Special Confessor 192

An Item of Premarital Advice 193

Communion for the Server 194

Kissing of Sacred Objects at a Requiem Mass 195

The Form of the Ciborium 195

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17. D. C.

Copyright 1957 by the Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

ANALECTA

Translation of the Recent Encyclical on the Pilgrimage to Lourdes 197

Translation of the Holy Father's Letter to Archbishop Montini on the Occasion of the Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Pope Pius XI 210

BOOK REVIEWS

Principles of Sacramental Theology, *by Bernard Leeming, S.J.* 212

History of the Catholic Church, *by Thomas P. Neill and Raymond H. Schmandt* 213

Deliver Us from Evil, *by Thomas A. Dooley* 214

I Remember Flores, *by Tasuku Sato and Mark Tennien, M.M.* 216

Now Available . . .

(By popular request)

HOW SHOULD PRIESTS DIRECT PEOPLE REGARDING THE MOVIES?

with APPENDIX—1957

by

The Very Reverend Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

Dean, School of Sacred Theology The Catholic University of America

This article originally appeared in the April 1946 edition of *The American Ecclesiastical Review*. An Appendix has been added, and the 16-page reprint is now available in an attractively bound, paper cover.

Single copy	30¢
In lots of 10	25¢ ea.
In lots of 25	22¢ ea.
In lots of 50	20¢ ea.

Prices Postpaid

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

The Catholic University of America Washington 17, D. C.

THE RECORD OF AN AMERICAN PRIEST: MICHAEL EARLS, S.J., 1873-1937

I

Twenty years have passed since Fr. Michael Earls, S.J., died unexpectedly at the age of sixty-two. At the time of his death and during the three decades prior to it he was a well-known figure in literary and educational circles. Few priests in this country were more widely known, for even his Protestant friends and acquaintances were legion. His literary output, for one so busy in the classroom, at the lectern and in the pulpit, was prolific. Whether his writings warrant space and a sketch in the scholarly *Dictionary of American Biography* on the score of significant contribution to American life will be decided by the board of editors who are, I suppose, appraising the achievements of those who died during the 1930's. Undoubtedly he is on the list. Whatever the judgment of the board be, Michael Earls is one who should not be forgotten. And his title to remembrance does not derive from his writings alone; indeed, it would be a mistake to judge the man by his novels, his poetry, his short stories, his memoirs![1]

Michael J. Earls, the first child in a family of ten, was born in Southbridge, Massachusetts, a mill town about seventeen miles from Worcester, on October 2, 1873. His parents were Irish immigrants and he owed much to his New England birth of Irish ancestry. Although he was at home in the market place of the twentieth century (no man was a stranger to him), he was a child and became a man of New England of the nineties. His heart remained in love with this era. To understand him one should delay on his years in this Yankee town. By some strange power Yankee rural atmosphere seemed to nurture the best in the Irish-American; the cultured, sociable, witty Michael Earls lent support to this contention.[2]

[1] The Michael Earls Collection in Dinand Library, Holy Cross College, has been the primary source for this study. However, Mrs. Michael Shaughnessy, Father Earls' sister, has been extremely helpful, by interviews and the loan of her own Earls collection, in this section on his early years in Southbridge.

[2] Early in life he abandoned the use of his middle name (James) and initial. There was only one Michael Earls.

The Quinebaug River made Southbridge; at least, it made it a mill town. The mills started to appear during the War of 1812 when embargoes and the declaration of war freed American industries from British competition. Industries attracted immigrants, first the Irish and then the French-Canadians. The Catholics had their own church by 1853, one which compared favorably with other churches in the town according to the local historian.[3] The French-Canadians arrived in large numbers during the fifties and sixties, and by the time Earls was born there were two parishes in the town. By then, too, Southbridge was a large town, with a population of 5740. To the older citizens the village center was taking on the appearances of a city. But beyond the center were hills and valleys, and the farm-houses, the fields and the woodlands still retained the appealing beauty of a New England countryside. Earls' love for flowers, trees, birds, brooks and woodland came early and took deep root. His introduction to nature came from his father who was a gardener.

Martin Earls settled in Southbridge in the late 1860's, a year or so after Mary Shaughnessy. They were married in 1872 in the new parish church Martin had helped to build. To support his wife and their large family he combined a mill job (night watchman) with gardening. Their wordly possessions were few, but they did possess what was needed to make a home and this they did with singular success. Few homes were happier. Young Michael found life pleasant in this home in Southbridge, and there he grew to know life (the New England life of the late nineteenth century) and to love it. This love for home and town were never disguised, and he borrowed generously from these surroundings for his short stories, probably his most effective prose writing.

Music and books were an important part of the family life from the start. Not that the Earls' home was cluttered with musical instruments and bookcases, for it was quite free of both. Nor did the two books which most shaped Michael Earls' early life come from the highly respectable town library. Both parents had good musical voices and a love for songs, and the most prized possession (prob-

[3] George Davis, *A Historical Sketch of Sturbridge and Southbridge* (West Brookfield, Mass., 1856), p. 190. For Southbridge during Earls' youth see D. H. Hurd (ed.), *History of Worcester County,* Mass. (Philadelphia, 1889), II, 995-1021.

ably the only one) Martin Earls brought from Ireland was a volume of Irish ballads. Irish ballads became a daily fare with the Earls, as important as the evening meal and frequently a richer fare. Irish ballads became an obsession, a pleasant obsession, with Michael Earls; to edit a volume of the best Irish ballads was one of his early projects. Like many of his projects, this was never realized, but the manuscript collection of Irish ballads in the Earls Collection in Dinand Library, Holy Cross College, and the letters of permission from authors and publishers to use them attest to the progress of the project and his devotion to the Irish narrative poem. His mother was responsible for the other important book in his early life. Shortly after the oldest children were born she purchased at considerable sacrifice *The Pictorial Lives of the Saints,* a large, well-printed digest of Butler's *Lives,* published by Benziger. It cost her more than the bookstore price, for she was compelled to pay on a half-dollar installment plan. Both parents now had a book which was shared by them and by their children. The reading of the life of the Saint of the day now became part of the daily fare.

Earls quit school for a job in the local mills before completing his secondary schooling, but he had no intention of settling for a life-long status of a mill-hand. He interrupted his education to help his parents and to finance his own college education, and there is little doubt that parents and son had decided on the college: Holy Cross in nearby Worcester where the sons of Irish immigrants were being prepared for the learned professions and the priesthood. He worked for three years in the Hamilton Woolen Mills. Though shrewdness was not of his character, this proved to be a shrewd move. For three years at a critical period he helped his parents financially (as we shall see, he made more than the other mill-hands), and then when schooling was renewed he completed five years of schooling in two. One could do this, if sufficiently able, in the late nineteenth century when promotion from one to another grade was less rigid than today.

Michael Earls was no ordinary mill-hand; at least, he was not during three or four evenings of each week. He was a teacher in the Southbridge public evening school. That a son of Irish immigrants with only a grammar school training was a teacher in a Yankee public school in the 1880's appears incredible, but such was

the case. However, his pupils were not the sons and daughters of the town fathers; they were for the most part the children of the French-Canadian immigrants who worked during the day in the mills beside him and who could neither write or speak English. Public evening schools owed their existence in Massachusetts mill towns to a law passed in 1887, known as the Illiterate Minor Bill. It was primarily a labor law, prohibiting the hiring of minors under fourteen and penalizing the employment of minors over fourteen who were illiterate and did not attend school. This second group of minors had a rough time of it for a few years; both mill-owners and parents wanted them in the mills and there they went when fourteen, but they were compelled to go to schools evenings until they learned to read and write in English. This was young Earls' task. When unoccupied at the mill and in the school room he worked in a drugstore. At early age Michael Earls learned how to keep three or four irons in the fire. Thereafter, he always had three or more projects in progress when it would have been more productive if he had concentrated on one.

In 1891, when he was approaching his eighteenth birthday, Earls was ready to resume his education. One would have expected him to enroll at Holy Cross where a prep school prepared students for the college course, but Earls shunned, when possible and legitimate, the expected. He saw an opportunity to indulge his love for travel and went to St. Joseph's College, in Memramcook, New Brunswick, a school conducted by the Congregation of the Holy Cross. Earls heard of St. Joseph's from his pastor, Fr. John M. Kremmin, who had a friend on the faculty and who could manage, if conditions warranted, a reduction of expenses. He remained there for two years, excelling, we are told, in athletics and musical activities, playing the trombone and the piano. We can assume he did fairly well in studies, for when the time came to enroll at Holy Cross in the fall of 1893 he did sufficiently well in his entrance examination to enter the second year of college. He had now made up the years spent in the mills with profit—in experience as well as in the needed coin.

Michael Earls became an autograph collector late in his first year at St. Joseph's. What he had in mind when he acquired a small album was a substitute for a college yearbook, a book of mementos of his days at Memramcook. During June 1892, before

he returned home for the summer vacation, he started to collect sentimental inscriptions autographed by his student friends; he brought it with him to Holy Cross, to Washington, and to Paris, and as his acquaintances with editors and writers widened during these years, he clipped their autographs from letters received and tipped them in corners and vacant spaces of the album's pages.[4] The small volume, the oldest document in the Earls collection, tells us much of Earls in and out of school: the sentimental strain in his character, the happy faculty of making friends with those marked for high posts in later years, his many contacts as he reached his majority with men of letters. The album is, of course, a source of information on his two years at St. Joseph's.

Earls entered the Latin Elements class and then studied rhetoric during his second year. If the twenty-two students who gladly subscribed their best sentiments (they may have had an assist from him) in the album are a fair sampling of the student body, St. Joseph's and Southbridge had much in common: about an equal number of boys of Irish and French-Canadian ancestry. A priest, Fr. S. J. Arsenault, C.S.C., appropriately enough, prefaced the collection of inscriptions with a quotation from *The Imitation of Christ:* "the true progress of man is self-negation." Most of the students took Earls' request quite seriously and penned heavy pledges of everlasting friendship. There were a few exceptions, and two of these explain why Father Earls was well known in the maritime provinces as a lecturer and a director of retreats.

A lad from Richibouctou, New Brunswick, Henry J. O'Leary, yielding to the request rather lightly, took the album, turned it upside down and wrote:

> Dear Michael
> When in this book you look
> And on this page you frown
> Think of the one who spoilt
> this book
> By writing in it upside down.

[4] The album became the subject of a chapter ("Autographs From a Prep School") in Earls' *Manuscripts and Memories Chapters in Our Literary Traditions* (Milwaukee, 1935). The editors' autographs in the album include John Wynne, S.J., *The Messenger,* Paul Dana, New York *Sun,* Joseph Cor-

On May 12, 1913, a year after Michael Earls was ordained a priest, Henry O'Leary was consecrated Bishop of Charlottetown, P.E.I., and when, in August 1920, Bishop O'Leary was promoted to the archdiocese of Edmonton, N.B., he was succeeded by Louis James O'Leary, Auxiliary Bishop of Chatham, N.B., another classmate at St. Joseph's. Louis O'Leary also contributed to the Earls album, and it is obvious from his inscription that he did not suspect his friend Michael was contemplating the seminary. Recalling John Boyle O'Reilly's verse about woman's distrust of woman, he added: "But that some true woman may trust you is the wish of your faithful friend Louis O'Leary." He was not the last person to misjudge his friend's ultimate destination. The two O'Learys became good press agents for Michael Earls in the maritime provinces. And Earls, in turn, had a store of pleasant memories of Memramcook to tell in the backyard of Holy Cross.

Earls entered Holy Cross when the college was celebrating its golden jubilee. It was still a small institution (one building with numerous additions east and west and upwards; a faculty of twenty-three; a student body of 291; a graduating class of forty-two in the scholastic year of 1893-94), but the college was entering a promising period in the 1890's, after a slow and at times discouraging recovery from the fire of 1852 which nearly terminated its brief existence. By 1893 the college had made its mark and no better proof could be found than a look at the hierarchy of the New England dioceses. When the college was founded in 1843 by Bishop Benedict Fenwick of Boston there was only one diocese in New England. As it celebrated its golden jubilee there were seven dioceses, and the bishops of five of these dioceses were Holy Cross alumni, while the coadjutor bishop with the right of succession in another was an alumnus. Only in Boston, where Archbishop John Williams presided, was there no alumnus bishop; John Williams received his college education before Benedict Fenwick founded Holy Cross. This roster of bishops alone gave the college considerable preeminence. Michael Earls from student days became part of Holy Cross. He spent all but a few years as a priest

---

coran, *The Guidon*, Robert S. Baldwin, *The Worcester Spy*, James Riley, *The Orphans' Bouquet*, Charles J. O'Malley, *Angelus Magazine*, Warren E. Mosher, *Mosher's Magazine*, Henry Austin Adams and Michael Dwyer, *Donahoe's*.

at the college and became, as one has remarked, "Holy Cross College's walking advertisement of its humanistic prowess."

The three years at Holy Cross (1893-1896), the year of graduate study in literature at Georgetown (1896-1897), and the following year in Europe (1897-1898), were the formative years in Earls' intellectual and literary development. He was and he always remained a son of the 1890's. His two volumes of historical essays and memoirs: *Under College Towers* (1926) and *Manuscripts and Memories* (1935) are filled with recollections of persons and personal experiences of this decade. During the nineties, he wrote in the latter volume, "young collegians were becomingly ready to tip the hat of honor to the craft of writers; without pedantry they talked about living authors, counting it a distinction to be personally acquainted with some of them."[5] A young Catholic with literary ambitions could not escape the atmosphere of optimism and confidence in Catholic literary circles; Maurice Francis Egan, Charles Warren Stoddard and Condé B. Pallen were the presiding spirits of the circle, but Earls was at this time more attracted to the exciting group who gathered around John Boyle O'Reilly in Boston: James Jeffrey Roche, Katherine Conway, Fr. John O'Brien and the prize of all, Louise Imogen Guiney. But they were of the Victorian nineties and this decade fared badly in the hands of the literary pontiffs of the post-war years. These heroes and friends of Earls became mere names at best to the students of the 1930's, and he chided them for neglecting their heritage while indulging in idle chatter "about the celerities and celebrities of the air and screen." The nineties will survive, he told them. They were inclined to smile, but it now appears he was far from wrong. An interest in Michael Earls may result from the revival of interest in the 1890's; the bright side of the decade can be gathered from an acquaintance with him.

There is no doubt what member of the Holy Cross faculty had the greatest influence on Earls. In after-years he never missed an opportunity to praise Terence J. Shealy, S.J., who as a young scholastic taught him rhetoric. He was Irish-born, "Irish to his fingertips," impressive in physical stature and more so in personality and mind which was steeped in classical literature, a master humanist at this early stage of his life with a gifted tongue and

[5] *Manuscripts and Memories*, pp. 3-4.

a warm heart. From Shealy's classroom journal came *The Purple,* the monthly literary magazine published by the students. The monthly received formal approval from the administration during Earls' second college year and he became an assistant editor. He was *The Purple's* second editor, and this monthly became the first free outlet for a mind and an imagination fretting for expression. He did write occasionally for the *Worcester Spy,* the *Springfield Republican* and the *Orphan's Bouquet* while at college, but a literary magazine was what he needed and for this he was ever grateful to Shealy.

Earls mixed his literary pursuits with football and dramatics. In football togs he does not give the impression of a born athlete and he lacks entirely the proof of a poet. He was more at home in his role in Henry IV as Master Quickly, Host of Boar's Head Tavern in Eastcheap. Earls was a master in the ways of a host. Scholastically he did not run away with the top prizes. In senior philosophy he ranked tenth, but even so he was one of the Commencement speakers; it was difficult to deny him a place on any stage. His topic was "The Influence of Example," and I suspect he had Terence J. Shealy, at this time pursuing his theological studies at Woodstock College, in mind; in any case, as Michael Earls addressed the faculty, the graduating class, the student body and their friends that June day, he was a second edition of his favorite teacher, with his own unique personality intact.

Earls' senior year had been a happy and fortunate one. When he returned from his vacation in Southbridge in the fall of 1895 he discovered a new student, older than himself and the other seniors, had enrolled at the college. In later years this student would tell Earls: "I have often thought gratefully of all your kindness to me at Holy Cross and of others who sat at our table." The new student was Charles Robinson and Earls was attracted to him immediately. Robinson, twenty-five years old and the son of Nugent Robinson, a well-known editor and man of letters, had already had a career which Earls envied. For the past three years he had been an assistant editor of the *North American Review,* but he had at last decided his vocation was the life of a Franciscan. With this in mind he had abandoned his promising career in journalism and had enrolled at Holy Cross to improve his Latin and Greek. One of the topics at table was Catholic journalism and Earls persuaded Robinson

to write an article on this topic for *The Purple*. He agreed, and "American Catholic Journalism" appeared in the February 1896 issue under the signature of C. R. It was and still remains a sympathetic but honest appraisal of Catholic journalism in the 1890's and it created a furore in many editorial offices. Some editors resented the criticism of their efforts (too much of it, according to Robinson, confined to a pair of scissors) and assumed the charges came from a member of the Holy Cross faculty hiding under a student's publication. All the furore pleased Earls no end and was long remembered after the author of the article became a well-known Franciscan as a professor, as an author and finally as Archbishop Pascal Robinson, Papal Nuncio to Ireland.

The Robinson article was followed by another bold and highly successful stroke. For his last issue as editor of *The Purple* he planned a special edition; the spectacular appealed to him and his position as editor gave him a fine opportunity to indulge this flare. He planned a Commencement issue (revising the format to its current size) which would cover the progress of the college during its first half-century and carry biographical sketches of prominent alumni and contributions from former students. He invited Louise Imogen Guiney to write a memoir of her father, General Patrick R. Guiney, a former Holy Cross student. In the mid-nineties Miss Guiney had already published or was writing her best poetry ("the most authentic and exquisite verse America has yet written," wrote Alice Brown in 1921) and was the pride of Boston, but she welcomed the chance to praise and pay her debt to her father. For Earls it meant entrance into the literary circle he had followed from afar, for the invitation was the beginning of their friendship, with frequent exchange of letters and publications. The Louise Imogen Guiney Memorial Room in Dinand Library is Earls' tribute to her.

Despite his longing for the priesthood (as he himself admitted) during his college years, Earls did not enter the seminary until 1898, two years after graduating from college. A conflict of interests explains the delay. His mother was quite willing to see her eldest son a priest, but she wanted him to be a diocesan priest living in the Springfield area where he could visit frequently. Michael Earls wanted to be a Jesuit, and this involved the possibility of a life-long separation. His father observed silence, of

the opinion, no doubt, that it was a decision outside his domain. Michael was in no hurry to dissolve the impasse and it appears he took advantage of it to follow another aspiration. He had long ambitioned a literary career.

His literary ambitions were probably quickened during his senior year at Holy Cross by an article in the March 1896 issue of the *Atlantic Monthly*. This magazine was available in the students' reading room, and as editor of *The Purple* he had an early opportunity to consult it. He could not miss this particular article; Miss Guiney's poem "An Elegy" was on the page (p. 301) which concluded an essay on "The Irish in American Life," by Henry Child Merwin. Although the basis of evaluation was the undisputed superiority of the Anglo-Saxon, Merwin's approach was sympathetic. He enumerated the gifts and defects peculiar to the Celtic spirit and listed the contributions of the Irish to American life. More and better contributions could be expected. When Celtic fire and imagination were joined with Anglo-Saxon restraint and sense of form, Americans could look forward to "great achievements in literature," and the two would coalesce, he thought, since the Irish were able to live with the Anglo-Saxon Protestant American "with astonishingly little friction." Did the editor place Miss Guiney's poem at the conclusion of this essay to illustrate Merwin's contention? It was a happy choice in any case, for she was an unexcelled example of his position.

Earls had the gifts Merwin found in the Irish: a ready wit, a lively imagination, a high degree of sociability, a poetic feeling, a sense of beauty. He was probably too young at this stage to know if he had what Merwin found to be common Celtic faults: a lack of restraint and a sense of form. However, he surely was free from any "conscious inferiority to the Anglo-Saxon race." There was no doubt in his mind which was the superior, the Celt or the Anglo-Saxon, and he would be strongly inclined to say the contributions of the Irish to American letters was not subject to any Anglo-Saxon virtue. Earls was well aware that the priesthood did not exclude the pursuit of literature and until the first had been definitely settled one way or the other what more natural than a year or two in graduate studies. The difference of opinion between himself and his mother was kept within the family circle, and his friends and acquaintances took it for granted his future career had

been decided when he enrolled at Georgetown in the fall of 1896 to study literature.

(To be continued)

Holy Cross College WILLIAM L. LUCEY, S.J.
Worcester, Mass.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for September, 1907, by Father M. J. Ryan of St. Bernard's Seminary, Rochester, is entitled "Conditions and Limitations of Doctrinal Development." Father Ryan asserts that "the Catholic principle of development stands in the centre between a mechanical fixity and a changeability governed by no law and not true to the past." He contends that "outside of the Church, attempts at progress in theology prove to be destructive, not constructive. It is only within the true Church, under the guidance of the living Authority which our Redeemer has set up for us, that progress can be conservative, and conservatism progressive." . . . Father T. B. Scannell, of England, writing under the heading "The Reform of the Breviary," makes some suggestions toward changes in the Divine Office that he believes would be most helpful from the liturgical standpoint (many of which have been subsequently introduced). He proposes a plan whereby all the Psalms would be recited in the Office in the course of the week. An interesting feature of his plan is that only two psalms would be recited at Tierce, Sext and None. . . . Father J. Selinger explains the recent reform of seminaries in Italy by Pope Pius X, and the translation of the letter from the Holy See prescribing in detail the course of studies to be followed in these seminaries is added to this article. . . . This issue contains the final chapter of the novel "A Clerical Story of Sixes and Sevens." . . . Father J. Fryar continues his interesting account of "Some Old English Wedding Customs." He tells us that at one time "it was the custom for the bride's maids to lead the bridegroom to the church, and for the bridegroom's men to conduct the bride." In former times there was a diversity of custom as to the finger on which the wedding ring was placed. . . . An anonymous writer begins a series of articles on the Syllabus of Errors against Modernism promulgated by Pope Pius X on July 3, 1907. The Syllabus is given in Latin in the *Analecta*. The author of this article emphasizes particularly the right of the Church to point out and to condemn erroneous notions in the field of science. . . . The *Analecta* also present the letter sent by the Holy Father to the American College at Louvain on the fiftieth anniversary of its foundation.

F. J. C.

THE PROBLEM OF PERIODIC CONTINENCE

Every priest is well aware, I think, that although it is Church teaching that children constitute the chief *bonum* or "blessing" of marriage, there is a large group both within and outside the Church who do not regard children as a "blessing" at all. The Christian ideal of fertility and family life is very often set aside—even by our Catholic Faithful—in the pursuit of other goals and other ideals which they set up for themselves. The willing and generous acceptance of the function of parenthood seems, in our times, to be giving way before the onslaughts of a determined propaganda that maintains, in one form or another, that man himself is the master and arbiter of life.

Very much aware of these trends, the Holy Father, in 1951, took the occasion of an address to the Italian Catholic Union of Midwives to set forth in clear and forceful language the Christian ideals and obligations of married couples.[1] In this allocution we have, for the first time in any papal document, an explicit treatment of fundamental principles regarding the practice of periodic continence by married couples.

Prior to this, the Sacred Penitentiary had issued some practical norms for confessors. In 1853, it said that "those who were practicing periodic continence with a legitimate reason were not to be disquieted, provided they did nothing positive to impede conception."[2] This norm was repeated on June 16, 1880, with the added bit of advice that the confessor could lawfully suggest the practice—with great care, however—to those penitents whom he could not successfully persuade to give up the detestable practice of contra-

[1] The English translation of this address is printed in *The Catholic Mind*, 50 (January, 1951), 49-64.

[2] The Sacred Penitentiary was asked for a solution to the following case: Quidam fideles coniugati, peritorum opinione medicorum innixi, persuasum habent plures esse in singulis mensibus dies, in quibus conceptio mulieris locum habere non potest. Suntne inquietandi illi qui matrimonio non utuntur nisi in illis diebus, saltem si legitimas habent rationes abstinendi ab actu coniugali? It replied: Non esse inquietandos illos de quibus in precibus, dummodo nihil agunt per quod conceptio impediatur. (The text of this reply is given by Lanza-Palazzini, *Theologia Moralis: Appendix de Castitate et Luxuria*, p. 85, note 2.)

ception.[3] But in 1932, when the S. Penitentiary was asked whether the practice of periodic continence when resorted to by mutual consent and for legitimate reasons was *in se* lawful, it evaded a direct answer.[4]

One other papal document is frequently referred to in discussions of periodic continence, viz., the Encyclical *Casti Connubii* of Pope Pius XI. The Encyclical stated that married couples were not to be considered as acting against nature if they used "their right in the proper manner, although on account of natural reasons either of time or of certain defects, new life cannot be brought forth."[5] Some authors claim that this passage contains a reference to the rhythm theory of ovulation and its lawful use in marriage. Others maintain that the reference to time is an allusion to the use of marriage subsequent to the menopause. The Encyclical, therefore, does not contain a clear and certain reference to the practice of periodic continence.

These documents bear witness to the theological discussion which had been going on for many years regarding the lawfulness of recourse to periodic continence by married couples as a means of avoiding conception. There were, and still are, several points of discussion. Is the practice of periodic continence lawful? If it is, is it *simpliciter* lawful, or lawful only under certain conditions? If the latter, what are the conditions? If the practice is not lawful, is it sinful in itself (or *ex objecto*) or is it sinful because of circumstances? If it is sinful, what is the gravity of the sin?

Perhaps it would serve the purposes of our discussion if we considered, first, the points on which theologians agree; secondly, those points on which there is still discussion; and, finally, the

[3] The text of this reply as given by Lanza-Palazzini, *loc. cit.*, is as follows: Coniuges praedicto modo matrimonio utentes iniquitendos non esse, posseque confessarium sententiam de qua agitur illis coniugibus, caute tamen, insinuare quos alia ratione a detestabili onanismi crimine abducere frustra tentaverit.

[4] Mahoney gives the text of this reply in *Clergy Review*, 37 (1952), 237: An licita in se sit praxis coniugum qui, cum ob iustas et graves causas prolem honesto modo evitare malint, ex mutuo consensu et motive honesto a matrimonio utendo abstinent praeter quam diebus quibus secundum quorundam recentiorum theoremata ob rationes naturales conceptio haberi non potest? Resp. Provisum est per responsionem S. Poenit. d.d. 16 iunii 1880 datam.

[5] Cf. *AAS*, 22 (1931), 561; *Five Great Encyclicals* (Paulist Press, 1945), p. 93.

Christian ideal which the confessor or spiritual adviser ought to propose to the married couple.

I

Theologians agree that the use of marital rights on the so-called sterile days (or days of low fertility as they are, perhaps with greater accuracy, called) is not wrong in itself. Pius XII, in his Allocution to the Midwives, explicitly points out that there is nothing sinful in a married couple's using their rights on the days of natural sterility as well as on the days of fertility.[6]

Theologians also agree that a married couple may lawfully abstain from the use of marriage. Continence in marriage, therefore, is not wrong in itself; for there is no obligation imposed on any married couple to use their marriage.

Finally, all agree that for a couple to abstain from the use of marriage during the days of natural fertility and to limit the use of their marriage to the days of natural sterility would require the verification of certain conditions; and, further, that if these conditions are not verified, there would be sin in such a manner of acting.

Now, what are the conditions which would justify the exclusive use of marriage during the sterile period? They are three: (1) both partners must be willing to abstain during the fertile period; (2) both must be able to abstain during those days without proximate danger of serious sin; and (3) there must be a proportionately serious reason for wishing to avoid children.

The first condition: both partners must be willing. Neither partner may insist on abstinence against the reasonable protests of the other. The reason for this is the marriage contract. By that contract each partner agreed to satisfy the reasonable and serious requests of the other for marital relations; for one partner to default on this contract would be a serious violation of justice. Accordingly, the practice of periodic continence would be lawful when, and just as long as, it is mutually agreeable to the spouses.

The second requisite is that both husband and wife must be able

[6] "If the carrying out of this theory means nothing more than that the couple can make use of their matrimonial rights on the days of natural sterility too, there is nothing against it, for by so doing they neither hinder nor injure in any way the consummation of the natural act and its further natural consequences." Cf. *The Catholic Mind, loc. cit.*, p. 56.

to practice continence during the so-called fertile days. The use of periodic continence demands no little self-control. When a couple attempt to restrict the use of marriage to the sterile period, there may arise occasions of serious sin. The attempt may lead to sins of self-abuse, to mutual fondling to the point of culpable pollution, and even to infidelity. These dangers are especially great in the case of men; but women are by no means exempt from them. In his consideration of this requisite, Father Gerald Kelly has written: ". . . for many (if not for most couples) the attempt to practice periodic continence may create a serious danger of gross incontinence. It is true that with the help of God they can avoid this danger; but they must *co-operate* with the grace. The co-operation often takes great courage, strength of character, and strong faith—qualities that some people do not possess. Because of this danger of incontinence, we generally recommend that those who wish to practice the rhythm consult their confessor or some other qualified spiritual director. He can help them by suggesting means of reducing their difficulty, of fortifying their wills, of obtaining God's more abundant help, and so forth."[7]

This consultation with a qualified priest is sometimes referred to as "getting the priest's permission" to practice rhythm. I find that expression somewhat repugnant, since it is the office of the priest consulted, not to grant or deny permission, but rather to pass judgment on the existence of the requisite conditions and to advise. It is for this reason that I usually recommend that people who wish to practice rhythm consult a qualified priest who knows them or is familiar with the conditions under which they are living, and that they consult him preferably together, and outside confession.

The third requisite is a good reason; that is, a sufficient reason for avoiding children. This requisite, it is true, has often been ignored by Catholic doctors in their published articles on rhythm. One recent instance is the book, *The Rhythm Way to Family Happiness,* by Murphy and Laux. This book does not sufficiently consider the need to have a good reason for avoiding childbirth. In the early days of the Ogino-Knaus reckoning, even certain moral theologians, according to Mahoney,[8] in their enthusiasm seemed

[7] Cf. *Medico-Moral Problems,* II, 27.
[8] *Clergy Review,* 37 (1952), 236.

to become propagandists of the sterile period and to ignore the conditions required for its lawful moral use. But at the present time, it may be doubted whether any Catholic moralist expressly teaches that Catholics may use this rhythm method exclusively, without having any compensating reason. All the recent manuals, and all contemporary theologians who treat this matter, *ex professo* insist on the verification of sufficiently serious reasons for avoiding children.

Finally, we have the teaching of Pius XII himself: "The moral licitness of such conduct on the part of the couple (i.e., the exclusive use of the sterile period for the exercise of marital rights) would have to be approved or denied according as to whether or not the intention of observing those periods constantly was based on sufficient and secure moral grounds. The mere fact that the couple do not violate the nature of the act and are prepared to accept and bring up the child which, in spite of their precautions, came into the world would not be sufficient in itself to guarantee the rectitude of intention and the unobjectionable morality of the motives themselves."[9]

What are some reasons which would justify recourse to the use of periodic continence for a long period of time? Happily, our present Holy Father has assured us that there may be such reasons in the medical, eugenical, economic and social order. Prior to Pius XII, the pronouncements of the Holy See indicated only one reason as justifying the use of rhythm; viz., as a remedy against onanism or contraceptive intercourse. It was not clear whether the mind of the Holy See was that this reason should be regarded as the only justifying reason, or merely that this reason was certainly a justifying one. Theologians writing before the address of Pius XII to the midwives were not wont to advance many good reasons for having recourse to the practice. Bonnar suggested poverty of the couple as an example.[10] Gougnard gave "periculum vitae" as well as "impossibilitas materialis numerosiorem prolem educandi."[11]

Father Kelly, commenting on the address of Pius XII, is good enough to suggest several more examples of sufficient reasons for the exclusive use of the sterile period: "(1) Childbirth would be

[9] *Address to Catholic Midwives, op. cit.,* 56 f.
[10] *The Catholic Doctor,* 1951, p. 77.
[11] *De Matrimonio,* p. 444.

dangerous, or one of the parents is too ill to help in the rearing of children (medical reasons); (2) the real likelihood of mental abnormality or serious heredity defect in children, or mental weakness on the part of the parents (eugenic reasons); (3) lack of housing facilities, over-population, the husband's employment in a public office, such as military service, which is at least temporarily incompatible with family life (social reasons); (4) the inability to provide decently for children according to the papal standard of a family living wage (an economic reason)."[12]

The priest whose responsibility it is to direct souls may well ask at this point: "Suppose one of these requisite conditions is not verified in a particular case, is there sin? And if so, is the sin serious?" The answer is, that if any one of the required conditions (viz., that the parties be willing to abstain, that they be able to abstain without proximate danger of serious sin, and that they have a justifying reason) is not met, recourse to periodic continence will be sinful. In certain cases it may even be seriously sinful.

For instance, if the first condition is not verified and the practice of periodic continence is insisted on by one partner against the reasonable objections of the other, a sin of injustice would be committed. In such circumstances one partner would be unjustly depriving the other of his right to the marriage act during the fertile periods. So also, if the second condition is not met and the practice of periodic continence becomes a proximate occasion of sins against chastity, there would be serious sin. The otherwise permissible practice of periodic continence becomes seriously wrong when it leads to grave danger of other mortal sins. Similarly there would be serious sin if the practice involves a proximate danger of divorce or break-up of the marriage, or of other sins against the obligations of married life.

Theologians agree on the possibility of serious sin in such circumstances as these, and I think it is important for priests to remember this when they are consulted by couples who wish to practice periodic continence. It would seem advisable for the priest, even before he attempts to decide whether or not the couple has a sufficiently serious reason for avoiding children, to determine whether the practice of periodic continence would involve grave

[12] *Medico-Moral Problems,* IV, 34.

sin on any of the grounds just considered. The practice of continence in marriage—even though periodic—is difficult. Especially is this true when a young couple wishes to practice it early in their married life. The priest adviser would be very prudent to point out to them that even though they may have a sufficiently serious reason for the practice, it does involve serious difficulties and dangers. They will need to rely very consciously and trustfully on the assistance of grace.

II

Although agreed that the practice of periodic continence without a sufficient reason would be sinful, theologians are not of one mind regarding the seriousness of the sin. For some years they have discussed whether the sinfulness of the practice is to be sought *ex obiecto* or merely *e fine vel circumstantiis.*

Apparently a strong argument can be made for the view that the unjustified use of periodic continence does constitute serious matter *ex obiecto.* Those who hold this view acknowledge slight matter, and consequently venial sin, when the practice is not continued for very long periods or where a quite substantial contribution to the conservation of the human race has already been made by the particular couple under consideration.

Authors who feel that the practice is *ex obiecto* seriously sinful regard the consideration of this problem by Pius XII in his allocution as corroboration of their view. They point out that the Holy Father devoted a great deal of space to the problem and definitely took sides in the controversy over the formal malice involved in the sin.[13]

[13] "Marriage obliges to a state of life which, while conferring certain rights, also imposes the fulfillment of a positive work in regard to the married state itself. In such a case one can supply the general principle that a positive fulfillment may be omitted when serious reasons, independent from the good will of those obliged by it, show that this action is not opportune, or prove that a similar demand cannot be reasonably made of human nature.

"The marriage contract, which confers upon husband and wife the right to satisfy the inclinations of nature, sets them up in a certain state of life, the married state. But upon couples who perform the act peculiar to their state, nature and the Creator impose the function of helping the conservation of the human race. This is the characteristic activity which gives their state

Next there is the fact that he demands *serious* reasons to justify the practice. Why should serious reasons be demanded if the obligation itself is not serious? Finally, there is the statement that those who illicitly practice periodic continence sin against the very meaning of conjugal life—a statement that easily leads one to consider the sin a very serious one.

Against this, as others argue, is the fact that the Pope nowhere says explicitly that the sin is mortal. In such an important matter, especially when he has pointedly taken sides on one element of an important controversy (viz., the formal malice of the sin), we should expect him to settle this other controverted point also, if he believed and wished to teach that the sin involved was mortal. Since he deliberately abstained from an explicit pronouncement, it can only be because he did not wish to settle the controversy on that point. According to these authors, then, the practice of periodic continence without sufficient reason is not in itself mortally sinful; at least, as some say, it cannot be demonstrated with certainty to be mortally sinful. It would be mortal sin only because of some special circumstance of injustice or of unwarranted proximate danger of serious sin (as has been noted already). The most that would be admitted by some of these writers is that the unjustified practice of periodic continence *for the duration of married life* would be seriously sinful. In this case the married couple while making use of the generative faculty, proper to their state and lawful in it alone, "always and deliberately withdraw, with no serious reason, from its primary obligation." According to the papal statement, this is a "sin against the very meaning of conjugal life"—and such a sin would certainly seem to be of itself serious.

Some indication of the extrinsic authority for these views may prove helpful. The view that the unjustified use of periodic continence is mortally sinful is held by Dodkorte, Van Mierlo, Salsman,

---

its proper value, the *bonum prolis*—the blessing of offspring. The individual and society, the people and the State, the Church itself depend for their existence in the order established by God, on fruitful marriage. Therefore, to embrace the married state, continuously to make use of the faculty proper to it and lawful in it alone, and on the other hand, to withdraw always and deliberately with no serious reason from its primary obligation, would be a sin against the very meaning of conjugal life." *The Catholic Mind,* January, 1952, p. 57.

Lavaux,[14] Griese, Connell, O'Donnell, McFadden, and Riley.[15] All the authors mentioned feel, generally, that the practice is sinful *ex obiecto;* that is, in itself, apart from any consideration of extrinsic circumstances or intention of the partners.

Among those who feel that the unjustified practice of periodic continence cannot be clearly demonstrated to be a mortal sin are Mahoney, Bonnar, Madden, Lanza-Palazzini, Regatillo-Zalba, and Lynch[16] who notes that there is a large group of theologians who remain unconvinced that mortal sin can with certainty be imputed to those who, without justifying reasons, resort to this practice.

The opinion that the unjustified practice of periodic continence for the entire duration of marriage can be seriously sinful, especially when marital relations are had with some degree of frequency, has developed since the statement of the Holy Father. Among the authors who have expressed this view are McCarthy, Huerth, Diamond, Wroe, Healy, Paquin, Kenny and Kelly.[17]

In view of this great diversity of opinion among moralists, what is the confessor or priest adviser to do? First of all, he should exercise great prudence when there is a question of imposing obligations. Surely, it is wrong to impose an obligation when it is not clear that there exists an obligation. Father Kelly's words are to the point: "In the meantime the fact that such disagreement exists should prompt both theologians and confessors to be very cautious about enunciating rigid practical rules. The dictum, 'non est imponenda obligatio nisi certo constat,' applies just as much to the gravity of an obligation as to its existence."

Because of the diversity of theological opinion on the gravity of the practice, no penitent who insists on continuing the practice of periodic continence can be refused absolution merely because he

[14] Cited by Lanza-Palazzini, *op. cit.*, pp. 78 f.

[15] *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* 120 (1949), 477 ff.; 126 (1952), 65 f.; *Morals in Medicine,* p. 207; *Medical Ethics* (4th ed.), p. 127; *Homiletic and Pastoral Review,* 57 (1957), 824.

[16] *Clergy Review,* 37 (1952), 236; *ibid.,* 512 ff.; *Australasian Catholic Record,* 32 (1955), 332-37 (cited by Fr. Lynch); *De Castitate,* p. 78; *Theologia Moralis* (1954), III, 998; *Theological Studies,* 17 (1956), 186.

[17] *Irish Ecclesiastical Record,* 78 (1952), 374; *Periodica,* 40 (1951), 421; *Clergy Review,* 37 (1952), 512; 38 (1953), 62; *Medical Ethics,* p. 166; *Morale et Medecine,* pp. 296 f.; *Principles of Medical Ethics,* p. 95; *Medico-Moral Problems,* IV, 32.

or she has not sufficient reason. Personally, I feel that the couple who resort to periodic continence without sufficient reason in order to avoid parenthood completely—or even in order to limit their family to one or two children—would be guilty of mortal sin. But if such a couple insists on continuing the practice, even though they have no good reason to do so, I would not feel justified in denying absolution.[18] Theological opinion is not yet sufficiently unanimous to rule out the probability of the view that their conduct is not certainly a serious sin; nor do we have any clear statement of the Church's magisterium that it is a mortal sin.

The likelihood of such a case as I have just described would appear to be rather small. As Father Bender[19] says: "Good virtuous people, worthy of the name of Christian, who are conscious of their duty to God, Church and Country do not think of deliberately limiting the number of children unless they are constrained by special and abnormal circumstances which are truly urgent." Most confessors, I think, will agree with Father Lynch that "very few of those who bother to seek moral advice on the problem are practicing or contemplating rhythm without reasons sufficient to justify their use of it—supposing always willingness and ability on the part of husband and wife. Sometimes the reasons they allege are too readily dismissed as insignificant, either because of a confessor's failure to evaluate those reasons realistically from the penitent's point of view, or because of an exaggerated notion of what is required for justifying cause. If a truly prudent judgment is made in every instance, I am convinced that very seldom will we encounter the case envisioned by those who dispute about the grave sinfulness of practicing rhythm entirely without sufficient cause."[20]

III

There is a tendency to limit the discussion of periodic continence to questions of strict morality, to concentrate almost exclusively on right and wrong, to attempt to draw the line between what may and what may not be done without committing sin. All too often

[18] I am assuming, of course, that there is no sin involved because of extrinsic circumstances, e.g., denial of reasonable requests for marital relations, proximate danger of sins against chastity, and so on.

[19] *Dizionario de Teologia Morale,* p. 328, s.v. *Continenza Periodica.*

[20] *Theological Studies,* 17 (1956), 186.

such discussions lose sight of the Christian ideal of family life. Hardly ever do we hear any mention of the ideal of parenthood or of family life as the ideal type of married life.

God instituted marriage as the means for the propagation of the race. The fruitful marriage, therefore, and not the sterile marriage, is the marriage that falls in best with God's plan. Having children is the primary goal of marriage. The family, therefore, consisting of father, mother and children is the ideal for the Christian.

Priests have been entrusted by the Giver of life with the responsibility of directing souls not merely in the avoidance of sin, but also in the development of a fuller supernatural life. They must be on their guard lest they neglect to present the ideal of family life as something after which every married couple should attempt to strive. The priest must be concerned lest he unconsciously assume the role of a counsellor of infertility.

In public discussions of rhythm—marriage preparation courses, pre-Cana and Cana Conferences, marriage forums, and so on—there is need for explicit reference to the fact that parenthood is the job of the couple entering marriage. We must insist—and I suppose it would be ideal if this insistence accompanied every discussion of periodic continence—that having children is the task to which couples oblige themselves by the very fact of marriage.

There is something amiss when a couple wishes to marry, yet does not want to have any children; or determine to postpone having children for one, two or more years; or intend to have only three or four or six children but no more. A priest friend of mine likens such people to a young man seeking ordination to the priesthood who makes the stipulation that he will never have to say Mass, administer the Sacraments, preach, or take duty. Such a young man would be seeking to avoid the very purposes for which men are ordained to the priesthood. So, too, the married couple who, without sufficient reason, seek to avoid children, fail to fulfill their purpose in life. Even the couple who has sufficient reason for practicing rhythm can be counselled to do more than is required by duty; to strive deliberately and consciously after the ideal.

The present Holy Father has said: "It is one of the fundamental demands of right moral order that a sincere inner acceptance of the office and duties (of parenthood) correspond to the use of

conjugal rights."[21] There must then be a willingness on the part of married persons and on the part of couples entering marriage to "serve motherhood" and fatherhood—a willingness to become parents. And we priests, directors of souls, ought to foster and encourage that willingness. If, as the Holy Father says, the Catholic midwife or obstetrician is expected to promote the patient's acceptance of the role of parent, how much more incumbent is this on the priest.

In most discussions with the laity on this subject, I get the rather disquieting impression that their interest in rhythm is not altogether compatible with the basic and necessary willingness to assume the role of parenthood. Perhaps more attention should be paid to what Dr. John Kane, of Notre Dame, calls the "almost unanimous conclusion" of sociological studies on marital happiness: "Happiness in marriage is not associated with the presence or absence of children in the family, but with a strong desire to have children."[22]

JOHN A. GOODWINE

St. Joseph's Seminary
Dunwoodie, Yonkers, N. Y.

[21] *Allocution to the Midwives:* cf. *The Catholic Mind,* 50 (1952), 54.
[22] *Grail,* 37 (March, 1955), 12.

"OUR TAINTED NATURE'S SOLITARY BOAST"

We may well be reminded these days of Wordsworth's expressive words about Mary Immaculate: "Our tainted nature's solitary boast." And we may also fittingly repeat the Church's own words of praise: "Tota pulchra es, Maria, et macula originalis non est in te." This should be particularly true in the United States, where we honor Mary as the Patroness of our country under her title of the Immaculate Conception.

Only three years ago the Catholic world celebrated the centenary of the proclamation of the dogma of Our Lady's Immaculate Conception by the observance of a Marian Year. Today the Church is looking forward to the observance of the hundredth anniversary of Mary's appearance to St. Bernadette at Lourdes.

Vast preparations have for some time been under way for the celebration of this outstanding event at Lourdes. It is estimated that fully six million individuals will visit the renowned shrine in the course of 1958. In this country work on the majestic shrine of the Immaculate Conception at Washington is going steadily forward, and there is hope that it will be brought to at least near-completion during the centenary year. All this is to the good. But we should hardly rest content with it alone. We must accompany it with a vast resurgence of devotion to the Mother of God. A giant crusade of the faithful to Lourdes will be a remarkable manifestation of faith. But it should be accompanied by even a far vaster crusade of prayer throughout the world. A shrine erected in stone to the glory of Mary Immaculate in our Nation's Capital will give visible testimony of our respect and love for her. But she must also be enshrined in the hearts and homes of the American people.

It is far from a secret that the nations of the world are troubled and the peoples convulsed. Half the world, one might say, is anti-God—at all events insofar as its leaders are concerned—and the other half is only too feebly expressing its fealty to the Supreme Ruler of mankind today. So, too, is it well known that truly devastating movements are afoot, effectively undermining the morals of

the people. Almost characteristic of our own country, one might say, are such features as a vicious literature and screen, a score of efforts to mislead the young, a host of profound family evils, and a basically baneful woman's movement that can only spell ultimate degradation to woman, and thereby to society.

Already following World War I, Pope Benedict XV wrote concerning the conditions of the times: "Our human society has reached that stage in which it stands in most urgent need of the aid of Mary Immaculate no less than of the joint efforts of all mankind." There is no conceivable doubt that this view would be concurred in by all his successors. The conditions he spoke of have consistently worsened rather than bettered since his day.

History teaches some telling lessons in this connection. The saving of Christian Europe through the stemming of the Moslem hordes at Lepanto through the intercession of Mary, for instance, is well known. But probably not so well known is the stemming of the degradation of society through devotion to Mary by a reversal of pernicious tides that have debased womankind. This should be particularly deserving of our attention in view of present conditions. To grasp at all fully their significance and far-reaching consequences, we must turn back the pages of history even to the days preceding Christ's advent upon earth.

For those who only know womankind in her elevated and honored position into which Christianity has placed her, it must be difficult indeed to understand the story of her oppression, and even degradation, before Christ's coming. It is a story that in no few parts reads like a veritable nightmare. It tells, namely, that after the fall of our first parents, those fertile seeds of love and devotion to each other that God had implanted into their hearts degenerated into the baser passions, and not infrequently not without the greatest detriment to woman's dignity. Though she had been created by God as man's helpmate, she was looked upon by some merely as a chattel marketable at will. Or again, she was considered by degenerate man simply as a toy, his delight so long as the fire of youth was in her eye and the bloom of beauty on her cheek, but when she grew old and infirm, it was not unheard of that she was thrust out of doors, homeless and uncared for, and someone younger and fairer than herself put in her place. Nor was it unknown that fathers had the power of life and death over their

wives and the children that they bore them. To us it may well seem incredible that man, born of woman, could have so victimized her. But the voice of history in the matter can hardly be questioned. That voice tells us unmistakably that, at least where mankind had fallen so low as to lose the natural virtues, such conditions were not infrequent before the coming of Christ upon this earth.

But with His coming, what a change! On the very threshold of Christianity we meet a woman who, to an ever greater and greater degree over the succeeding centuries, received honor and glorification, far greater than that which any creature before or after her received. This woman, of course, was Mary, the Mother of Christ. For, when Christ came into this world of ours, He chose a woman for His Mother, and He made her the greatest and grandest of His creatures in heaven and on earth. He in her and for her sake raised up womankind generally from the degradation of paganism, and made her once more the partner and equal of her husband and the heart of the home. He honored and uplifted all womankind in Mary, the Mother of God.

As is recorded on the very first page of the Gospel of St. Luke, an angel came down to earth from heaven and, prostrating himself before one whose name was Mary, made known to her the mind of God regarding the Redemption of the human race. Greeting her as no other creature before or after her had ever been greeted, "Hail, full of grace . . . blessed art Thou amongst women," he asked her consent to become the Mother of God.

What a profound revolution that implied! Woman, hitherto often despised and even degraded, suddenly became the most honored and exalted. Well indeed might Mary cry out jubilantly in her canticle, the Magnificat: "My soul doth magnify the Lord. He that is mighty hath done great things to me. . . . Henceforth all generations shall call me blessed." Hers was a true prophecy. There are millions who, now after two thousand years, call her blessed every day through the recitation of the Angelic Salutation alone.

Following the Annunciation and the virgin birth, glimpses are given us of Bethlehem and Nazareth, of Cana and Calvary, all revealing a Woman of unspeakable majesty and holiness. The serene light of her glory falling upon the rest of womankind changed them in their own eyes and the eyes of their brethren. Thought and sentiment in their regard were entirely revolutionized. A new

concept of womankind, a concept entirely different from that of the pagan one that went before, was born upon this earth. The sinless Madonna became an object of admiration and the ideal of womanly honor.

The results were truly remarkable. Step by step the odious fiction of woman's inferiority tottered and fell, as did the paganism that had begotten it. An atmosphere of chivalry permeated the Christian world; quickening to new life her withered nature and evolving a new type of womanhood. Through the influence of an ever-mounting devotion to Mary, her spiritual endowments now blossomed forth into full bloom—her strong faith and vital love, her comfort and facility in prayer, her abhorence of the vicious, her heroism in suffering and tenderness in sympathy—all the very qualities that make woman womanly, that make her pleasing to God and a treasure to her husband, the delight of her children and the heart of the home.

Within convent walls there now developed strong dignified types of womanhood to whom the world today might well look for examples of the model woman. Beneath the modest garb of her voluntary virginity, woman, ennobled through Mary, appeared as a vision from another and better world. History adds how, through long years of intemperate barbarism and but partially disciplined brute force, the nun's veil became the charter of woman's true freedom. To this day that veil has ever remained the symbol of a truly emancipated womanhood, giving the wedding ring a far nobler and more sacred meaning than would be possible were woman less free and independent in the choice of a state of life.

Outside cloister walls there simultaneously arose that most attractive and cherished institution of earth, the Christian home, that unique social unit that has made woman in her capacity of Christian mother, the greatest influence for good on earth, second only to one, the Church of God, of which the Almighty Himself has made her the symbol.

God alone knows what a powerful factor for good Christian woman has therein become. It is the Christian mother that has made possible the Christian home. She is its life blood, its very heart. If there are any two words in the English language that are most closely associated, they are "mother" and "home." If there is any sphere in which the mother's influence is particularly

felt, it is in the home. It is there she quietly sheds sunshine and encouragement all around her. There the little ones whom God has given her cling to her and look for a smile of approval, a word of appreciation. Their innocent hearts go out to her in child-like love and simplicity, and whatever mother says and does must be right for them. They ply her with questions without thought of doubting her answer. They appeal to her as if she were omnipotent. From her lips the science of God first flows upon them. Her knees are the first pulpit whence they learn the truths of salvation.

Here we have indeed a field for the exercise of the womanly qualities of love, gentleness, sacrifice and sympathy of a God-fearing mother. Here there is an opportunity unrivaled to reap a golden harvest of souls for the Kingdom of God, preparing His little ones, her own children, one day to take the place of the fallen angels in heaven. Here there is opportunity to mold the character of the young and thereby to shape the destinies of men and of nations. For the heart that vitalizes and quickens the domestic world ultimately leavens society. It has well been said that men make the laws but that women make the morals. And would anyone dare maintain that the latter are not more important than the former?

If we would see the magnetic power of woman given through Mary, bear fruit, we might well recall St. Helena who gave the world the first Christian Emperor, Constantine the Great, and thereby gave liberty untrammeled for the first time to Christ's Church on earth. Or, we might think of Blanche of Castile, who made her son, Louis, a warrior, a statesman, and a great saint. Again, there is the royal Elizabeth of Hungary who has gone down in history as a paragon of Christian charity. Indeed, once ennobled and restored to her long lost place through Mary, Christian heroines have been found in every walk of life. Just to think of France, for instance, the names of Genevieve, the lowly shepherdess, of Joan of Arc, and of Bernadette readily come before us. And these by no means stand alone. Hundreds of others are recorded in history.

But, unfortunately, in the world today we see a return in no small measure to those earlier days of a pagan womanhood. While the results of centuries of influence of Mary are not easily erased, they have nonetheless, as a matter of fact, been extensively rubbed

out. Great numbers of women today do not seem to realize what womankind owes to Mary's influence. These refuse to recognize her as their Mother. They refuse to venerate and honor her as the Mother of God or to model their lives after her. As a result the type of woman developed through Mary is being in great part replaced in the world at large today by that peculiar product of our age which might be termed the radical woman. Certainly only a want of comprehension of her own far-reaching influence in her peculiar sphere, and a lamentable failure in that sphere could have made possible that abnormality of the times that merits that title.

By the term "radical woman," allusion is not made here to those who deem the suffrage useful for civic purposes. Nor is reference made thereby to those who, under economic pressure, are forced into competition with men, causing the time-honored sentiment that the home is the proper sphere of woman to yield somewhat to the compulsion of regrettable circumstances. Nor, again, are those held in mind who feel that organized effort on the part of women for the protection of home and society is necessary. Rather is the reference made to those who would in everything ape men—those, in other words, who would simply make men of themselves and put the functions of wife and mother as a discount. By such, domestic life is voted dull and antiquated. The sphere of woman, as interpreted by Christianity, is utterly too narrow and confining. It must be expanded until in every direction it reaches that of man. Woman's attention must be entirely directed to the public life and away from the home.

The whole tendency is wrong. It runs directly counter to the laws of nature. The Creator did not plan a world consisting only of men. What a strange world that might well be! He created man and woman. He made them different, not identical. Neither is perfect. The one is the complement of the other. The two together, each with their own characteristics and qualities, each with their own functions in their own peculiar sphere, make up the ideal that God has given us, and that mankind and society need.

The symptoms of this plague of our day can easily be recognized. By innuendo and by open statement, woman is led to believe that nothing worthy of a human creature has been accomplished by her in the past except when she entered freely into competition with man. Household duties are represented as something in the nature

of Egyptian bondage. The petty tasks of home are dwelt upon entirely dissociated from love and religion. Motherhood is described without its inspirations, without its rewards and delights, not to say without the eternal hopes to which it gives birth. Indeed, motherhood is decried as an enemy whenever it interferes with personal aspirations. In a word, such disparage by every possible method woman's purely womanly qualities.

Such sentiments may of course become very depressing to a youthful wife and mother, and even utterly destructive of the happiness and holiness of the home. All the joy and courage in the accomplishment of the divinely appointed tasks of woman are taken away. The love and ambition that God implanted in her soul are belittled and debased. Her sacrifices are mentioned only with pity and apology, and all the dignity and beauty that the light of another world has cast over her work are ruthlessly brushed aside.

And what is the result of this abnormal development? It is eating like a canker into the heart of woman. It is eating deep into her happiness, her dignity, her every virtue and prerogative which Christianity has assured her. Unless checked, it will eat the very heart out of her womanliness. We can hardly go into detail here but one sees the results in this country, for instance in our many women characterized by a selfishness run rampant, and in myriads of divorcees and other social discontents. Abroad, one finds it at its acme in the hard and blatant women leaders in the Communist movement. What a ghostly contrast these form to the ideal Christian woman!

Only a calamity can result if this tendency becomes widespread enough to constitute a general state of things. Such a result is by no means unthinkable. When womankind forgets the gulf of shame and sorrow from which the influence of Mary Immaculate has lifted her, she may well be driven back to even worse than pagan bondage. She may be driven into the shameful debasement of civilized depravity.

When we fully grasp this threatening danger, how significant the words of warning of Benedict XV, which we quoted. How meaningful, too, the Church's efforts over the past century, in which this baneful movement was growing apace, to develop anew a great devotion to Mary, the Mother of God and our own blessed Mother. During the half-century, from 1854 to 1904, that is from

the proclamation of the Immaculate Conception by Pius IX to the celebration of the dogma's golden jubilee by Pius X, October was declared the month of the rosary and May the month of Mary throughout the Christian world. Furthermore during this period and in the years that followed, there was a noteworthy growth in devotion to Mary among our Catholic people. This was in no small measure prompted by the appearance of Mary Immaculate at Lourdes in 1858, and by the many miracles wrought at her shrine even down to the present day. Further impetus has come from the appearance of Mary at Fatima.

But impressive as this development has been, it must not be forgotten that the opposite development has also been very awesome. Hence a redoubling of effort to bring about an even greater and more whole-hearted return to her whom we honor as "Our tainted nature's solitary boast" is a great need of the day. And what more fitting time for answering that need than now, as we look forward to the centenary of Mary Immaculate's appearance at Lourdes.

EDGAR SCHMIEDLER, O.S.B.

Paola, Kansas

THE ENCYCLICAL *PASCENDI* AND THE MODERNIST FRAME OF MIND

The eighth day of this month of September marks the fiftieth anniversary of the appearance of the encyclical *Pascendi dominici gregis,* probably the most important single document issued by the *magisterium* of the Catholic Church thus far during the course of the twentieth century. This occasion offers every priest, and every other person who is deeply interested in the recent history of sacred theology and of the Catholic Church, a valuable opportunity to review the content of this encyclical and to consider the effects it has achieved in the life of the Church during the past half-century. The results of such an inquiry cannot be other than interesting and enlightening.

The first step in such an examination of the content of the *Pascendi dominici gregis* and of its treatment in Catholic literature must obviously consist in an attempt to appreciate its historical and doctrinal context. The *Pascendi* was published shortly after the beginning of the fifth year of the pontificate of St. Pius X. It was the supreme, the climactic, act of what was the most important of the many projects instituted and pursued by that great Sovereign Pontiff. We must not allow ourselves to forget that the campaign for the triumph of divinely revealed truth over the misstatements of the Modernists was carried on together with other operations of the same Holy Father. At the very time when he was striving for the triumph of Catholic truth over the errors spread abroad by the Modernists and their sympathizers, St. Pius X was planning and working for the reform of Church music, for a change in the method of promulgating pontifical acts, for the encouragement of earlier and more frequent reception of Holy Communion by the faithful, for the reorganization of the Roman Curia, for the codification of ecclesiastical law. And, during that same period, he was directing the Church in France and Portugal in such a way as to preserve the purity of the faith and the independence of the Church in the face of obstacles set up by hostile governments.

Thus, if he is at all aware of its historical context, no honest man could ever bring himself to assert that the *Pascendi dominici gregis* was in any way the work of a man in love with the *status quo* as

such. It was the work of one of the finest, and, in the good sense of the term, most progressive minds God has ever given to a supreme ruler of His Church on earth. The man who reorganized the Roman Curia, who inaugurated the work for the codification of the canon law of the Western Church, who reformed ecclesiastical music and who boldly insisted upon earlier and more frequent reception of Holy Communion was not a timid soul distrustful of all change. And the Roman Pontiff who outmaneuvered the anti-Catholic French government and who overrode the hesitancy and timidity of some of his more influential children in the Catholic Church in France was very obviously and very definitely not a man who could justly be accused of a lack of knowledge of the world in which he lived. This was the man, the great and holy Pope, who issued the *Pascendi dominici gregis.*

The *Pascendi* also falls within a definite context in terms of the anti-Modernist activity of St. Pius X. The first great document directed against the errors of the Modernists was the Holy Office decree *Lamentabili sane exitu,* dated July 3, 1907, and approved and confirmed by St. Pius X the following day. This document "condemned and proscribed" sixty-five propositions, characterized as the "chief errors" of this group. A little more than two months later the *Pascendi* itself was issued. On Sept. 1, 1910, St. Pius X published a motu proprio entitled *Sacrorum antistitum.* Into it was incorporated the famous "Oath against the Errors of Modernism."

Now it is quite obvious that, from the time the *Lamentabili* and the *Pascendi* were first promulgated, the Church has always wanted its children, particularly those engaged in the teaching of Christian doctrine, to pay special attention to and sedulously to accept the content of both these documents. Both St. Pius X and his immediate successor, Pope Benedict XV, took occasion to repeat and to confirm what had been taught in the Holy Office decree and in the encyclical. Both spoke with extraordinary force and emphasis on this subject.

Two acts of St. Pius X in this regard are especially noteworthy. In the motu proprio *Praestantia Scripturae Sacrae,* issued on Nov. 18, 1907, little more than two months after the appearance of the *Pascendi* itself, we find the statement: "Auctoritate Nostra Apostolica iteramus confirmamusque tum *Decretum* illud Congregationis Sacrae Supremae, tum *Litteras* eas Nostras *Encyclicas,*

addita *excommunicationis* poena adversus contradictores."[1] The *Praestantia* declares furthermore that the excommunication incurred by those who contradict the teachings of the *Lamentabili* and the *Pascendi* is reserved to the Holy Father himself. By reason of this ruling the *Praestantia* is listed as one of the sources of canon 2317 of the Code of Canon Law. Hence the penalty imposed by St. Pius X on those who contradict the doctrine of these two anti-Modernist documents remains in force.

The Oath against the Errors of Modernism was incorporated into the text of the motu proprio *Sacrorum antistitum,* issued by St. Pius X on Sept. 1, 1910. A long section of the text of the *Pascendi* was likewise incorporated into the text of the motu proprio. And, in the Oath itself, there is contained an assertion of acceptance of all the teachings of the *Lamentabili* and the *Pascendi.* "Me etiam, qua par est, reverentia, subiicio totoque animo adhaereo damnationibus, declarationibus, praescriptis omnibus, quae in Encyclicis litteris *Pascendi* et in Decreto *Lamentabili* continentur, praesertim circa eam quam historiam dogmatum vocant."[2]

In his inaugural encyclical, the *Ad beatissimi,* Pope Benedict XV spoke of the "monstruosi errores *Modernismi,* quem recte Decessor Noster *omnium haereseon collectum* edixit esse et solemniter condemnavit." And he added: "Eam Nos igitur condemnationem, venerabiles Fratres, quantacumque est, hic iteramus."[3] It is interesting to note, incidentally, that in recent times some individuals have attempted to interpret the *Ad beatissimi* as containing a rebuke, not to Modernism and its supporters, but to the Catholic writers and teachers who, from the outset, had worked to unmask and refute the false teachings of the Modernists.

In the light of the teaching of these three papal documents, the *Praestantia Scripturae Sacrae,* the *Sacrorum antistitum,* and the *Ad beatissimi,* it is quite evident that the Catholic Church wills that both the *Lamentabili* and the *Pascendi* should be carefully studied by its own children. This is particularly evident by reason

[1] The text of the *Praestantia Scripturae Sacrae* is found in the *Codicis Iuris Canonici Fontes,* cura Emi-Petri Card. Gasparri editi (Vatican Polyglot Press, 1933), III, 724 ff. This passage is found on p. 726. Subsequent references to this volume will use the initials *CICF.*

[2] *CICF,* III, 784. *Denz.,* 2146.

[3] *CICF,* III, 842.

of the fact that the anti-Modernist oath, which so many of the clergy are obligated to take, contains a promise to God that the person taking it will accept and will continue to hold the teachings set forth in these two statements. It is quite obvious that the Catholic Church would never want a man to take an oath of that kind without knowing the content of the documents whose teachings he swears to hold.

The *Lamentabili* is a comparatively easy document to study. It contains a brief introduction that explains the need of a condemnation, and then sets forth sixty-five theses being defended by unorthodox Catholic writers of the time. It simply informs us that all of these propositions are condemned and proscribed by the Holy Office, and that the Sovereign Pontiff, St. Pius X, "approved and confirmed the decree of the Most Eminent Fathers [the Cardinals of the Holy Office] and ordered that each and every one of the above-listed propositions be held by all as condemned and proscribed."[4]

The *Pascendi dominici gregis,* on the other hand, is one of the most difficult documents ever issued by a Sovereign Pontiff. The difficulty in reading and studying it arises from the fact that it contains a solid and profound analysis of the Modernistic position itself. St. Pius X realized that there could be no ultimately effective repudiation of the teaching set forth by the enemies of the Church who worked to destroy it from within apart from an exposition of their own system. As he put it:

> Because it is a most astute tactic of the Modernists (as they are rightly and commonly known) to present their teachings without order and systematic arrangement but in a scattered and disjointed manner to make it appear that they themselves are hesitant and uncertain, whereas, on the contrary they are quite fixed and unwavering, it is best, Venerable Brethren, first to bring these doctrines here together into one group, and to point out the bond by which they are connected with one another, so that we may then examine the causes of the errors and prescribe remedies to remove the evil.[5]

---

[4] *Denz.,* 2065 a. There is an English translation of the *Lamentabili sane exitu* in *All Things for Christ: Encyclicals and Selected Documents of Saint Pius X,* edited by Vincent A. Yzermans (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1954), pp. 223-28.

[5] *Denz.,* 2071; *CICF,* III, 691; *All Things for Christ,* p. 91.

The paragraph just quoted points out the basic organization of the *Pascendi.* This encyclical contains an introduction and a brief conclusion. The body of the document is divided into two main sections, the one primarily doctrinal and the other disciplinary in character. The doctrinal part, which is the longest portion of the *Pascendi,* is subdivided into three sub-sections. In the first of these St. Pius X analyzed and explained the Modernist frame of mind in terms of the seven areas within which the innovators' efforts were chiefly expended. In the second he indicated the bond of unity which made Modernism as such liable to the designation: *omnium haereseon collectum.* In the third and last sub-section of this doctrinal part of the *Pascendi,* St. Pius X indicated the causes of the errors, including both the subjective deficiencies of its leaders and the highly efficient and unscrupulous campaign carried on in favor of the Modernistic doctrine and their supporters.

The first characteristic of the *Pascendi* to strike the reader is its note of extreme urgency. From the very outset, St. Pius X makes it clear that his efforts are being directed against "the enemies of the Cross of Christ, who, by arts that are entirely new and full of deceit, are striving to destroy the vital energy of the Church, and, as far as in them lies, utterly to subvert the very kingdom of Christ."[6] He laments that many of these enemies of the Church "belong to the Catholic laity, and, what is much more sad, to the ranks of the priesthood itself."[7] These workers against the Church from within its own membership are described as "animated by a false zeal for the Church, lacking the solid safeguards of philosophy and theology," and as "thoroughly imbued with the poisonous doctrines taught by the enemies of the Church."[8]

St. Pius X takes cognizance of the fact that the most dangerous of these enemies of the Church are men of great activity and of considerable competence in some academic fields. He knows that "they possess, as a rule, a reputation for irreproachable morality."[9] But ultimately, he admits, "there is the fact which is all but fatal to the hope of cure," the fact "that their doctrines have given such a bent to their minds that they disdain all authority and brook no

[6] *CICF,* III, 690; *All Things for Christ,* p. 89.
[7] *Ibid.*
[8] *Ibid.*
[9] *CICF, ibid.; All Things for Christ,* p. 90.

restraint; and, relying on a false conscience, they attempt to ascribe to a love of truth what is in reality the result of pride and obstinacy."[10]

The *Pascendi dominici gregis* is chiefly remarkable for its relatively long doctrinal section. The first part of this considers the system of the Modernists as it appears in seven different areas of Catholic thought and activity. "The Modernist," St. Pius X tells us, "sustains and includes within himself a manifold personality; he is a philosopher, a believer, a theologian, an historian, a critic, an apologist, and a reformer. These roles must be clearly distinguished one from another by all who would accurately understand their system and thoroughly grasp the principles and the outcome of their doctrines."[11] The first part of the doctrinal section of this encyclical then proceeds to analyze and to expose the teachings and the reasonings of the Modernist system within each of these seven fields.

The Modernist polemic against the *Pascendi* was based, in great measure, on attempt to misrepresent this portion of the encyclical. The enemies of the Church tried to make it appear that the Pope was depicting each individual Modernistic leader as having explicitly held every one of the positions described in this first portion of the doctrinal part of the *Pascendi.* This propaganda could have been successful only among those who had no knowledge of the encyclical's contents.

The *Pascendi* describes a coherent and well organized system of thought, or rather of unbelief. But, in the very course of the description, we are shown that no one of the Modernist leaders had ever set forth this system in all of its details in any one utterance or publication. What St. Pius X was trying to show, and what he actually brought out so successfully, was that the various statements made by the Modernist leaders in different fields of thought in opposition to the teaching of the Catholic Church had certain definite and manifest presuppositions and implications. The primary objective of the doctrinal section of the *Pascendi dominici gregis* was to show that the various Modernistic teachings in different fields of religious thought had ultimately the same presuppositions,

[10] *Ibid.*

[11] *Denz.*, 2071; *CICF,* III, 691; *All Things for Christ,* p. 91.

and led to the same inferences. Thus, despite the fact that a man like Loisy might be doing most of his work in the area of biblical criticism, a man like Le Roy might be concentrating on the fields of apologetics and dogma, and another like Von Hügel might be lecturing and writing on the characteristics of the believer, all of them as Modernists, worked in view of the same presuppositions, and all of them led to the same group of inferences.

The first of the fields within which the erroneous teachings of the Modernists were to be found was, in the schema of the *Pascendi,* that of philosophy. In this encyclical St. Pius X insists that the primary presupposition of the Modernistic leaders in the realm of philosophy is that of Kantian agnosticism. We are told that: "According to this teaching [of Modernism] human reason is confined entirely within the field of *phenomena,* that is to say, to things that appear, and in the manner in which they appear: it has neither the right nor the power to overstep these limits. Hence it is incapable of lifting itself up to God, and of recognizing His existence, even by means of visible things. From this it is inferred that God can never be directly the object of science, and that, as regards history, He must not be considered as an historical subject."[12]

The *Pascendi* then goes on to point out the fact that, in this particular area, the teachings of the Modernists are essentially a contradiction of truths set forth clearly, infallibly, and authoritatively in the Vatican Council's constitution *Dei Filius* and in canons attached to this constitution. Historically, of course, Modernism was one stage or one aspect of the liberal Catholic opposition to the official teaching of the Catholic Church, an opposition directed with particular intensity against the teachings set forth by the Vatican Council.

The encyclical brings out the fact that the basic postulate of the Modernists moves them to reject, as merely intellectualistic, the traditional teachings of natural theology, the Catholic teachings about the motives of credibility, and the recognition of divine revelation as a communication from God which is truly external and distinct from man himself. It is on this fundamental issue that Modernism contradicts the truths set forth by the Vatican Council.

[12] *Denz.,* 2072; *CICF, ibid.; All Things for Christ, ibid.*

Agnosticism is the ultimate negative postulate of the Modernists. Their basic positive principle, on the other hand, is that of vital immanence. These people, recognizing the existence of religion in men, and holding that this factor can never be explained adequately on an objective basis, turned to an essentially subjective explanation and justification of religion. Man, according to the teaching they accepted, manifests a need for the divine, and this exigency stirs up a special sense which in some way contained the divine reality within itself, both as its object and as its intrinsic cause. For the Modernists this sense, rooted in man's subconscious mind, contained or constituted both faith and revelation. And when they spoke or wrote about faith and revelation, they understood them in this manner.

According to the principles that guided the thought of the Modernists, faith is concerned with what is really in the field of the unknowable. Hence, when faith seizes upon some historical figure, like that of Our Lord Himself, it attributes to Him certain characteristics which science can neither find nor acknowledge. The faith then was said to transfigure and to disfigure historical events or personages according to its own demands. And it was the business of the historian to cut away from the figure of Our Lord all of the characteristics which this "faith" had attributed to Him. In this way a man could at the same time be a believer, and hold by faith certain teachings about Our Lord which true history could never acknowledge, and be a historian, and reject these same teachings as utterly unscientific. To the agnostic Modernist, both judgments would be perfectly in order.

The *Pascendi dominici gregis* warns that the subjectivist Modernistic teaching about vital immanence and about the religious sense colors and animates all the teachings contained in this erroneous system. Thus it brings out the fact that the Modernists hold that the religious sense, like all the other cognitive faculties of the human being, has been evolved and perfected over the course of the millennia of history, and that the various religions existent in our own time are, in the last analysis, only highly developed forms of this basic religious sense. Even the Catholic religion, according to this type of thought, is nothing more than a religious sense which has been especially perfected through the influence of Our Lord.

Within the Catholic religion, the primitive formulae of faith and Catholic dogmas are described by the Modernists as the effects of the human intellect working on the datum of the religious sense. St. Pius X brought out the fact that these heretics thought of dogmas as mere symbols with reference to the object they were supposed to describe, and as mere instruments with reference to the men and the society that employed them. According to the Modernist frame of mind, these dogmas must always be controlled, not by any ecclesiastical authority, but, ultimately by the human heart, speaking for the basic religious sense. These heretics represented dogmas as essentially mutable in their significance.

St. Pius X showed that these basically philosophical errors colored and animated all the teachings of the Modernists in other fields. The first of these areas which he explores in the *Pascendi dominici gregis* is that of Catholic belief itself. He shows that, in virtue of what the Modernists hold about the religious sense and about the nature of religious truth, they are consistent in asserting that all religions are true.

Here it is well to note at once that, given this doctrine of *experience* united with that of *symbolism*, every religion, even that of paganism, must be held to be true. What is to prevent such experiences from being found in any religion? In fact, that they are so is maintained by not a few. On what grounds can Modernists deny the truth of an experience by a follower of Islam? Will they claim a monopoly of true experiences for Catholics alone? Indeed, Modernists do not deny, but actually maintain, some confusedly, others frankly, that all religions are true. That they cannot feel otherwise is obvious. For on what ground, according to their theories, could falsity be predicated of any religion whatsoever? Certainly it would be either on account of the falsity of the *religious sense* or on account of the falsity of the formula pronounced by the mind. Now the *religious sense*, although it may be more perfect or less perfect, is always one and the same; and the intellectual formula, in order to be true, has but to respond to the *religious sense* and to the believer, whatever be the intellectual capacity of the latter. In the conflict between different religions, the most that Modernists can maintain is that the Catholic has more truth because it is more vivid, and that it deserves with more reason the name of Christian because it corresponds more fully with the origins of Christianity.

No one will find it unreasonable that these consequences flow from the premisses. But what is most amazing is that there are Catholics

and priests, who, We would fain believe, abhor such enormities, and yet act as if they fully approved of them. For they lavish such praise and bestow such honor on the teachers of these errors as to convey the belief that their admiration is not meant merely for the persons, who are perhaps not devoid of some merit, but rather for the sake of the errors which these persons openly profess and which they do all in their power to propagate.[13]

The encyclical points out that the Modernists are led to their conclusion that all religions are true from yet another set of principles. These heretics represented tradition as "a communication to others of an *original experience,* through preaching by means of the intellectual formula." From this the *Pascendi* goes on to observe:

> Sometimes this communication of religious experience takes root and thrives, at other times it withers at once and dies. For the Modernists, to live is a proof of truth, since for them life and truth are one and the same thing. Thus we are once more led to infer that all existing religions are true, for otherwise they would not survive.[14]

It is intersting to note that in this last context the available English translation is seriously at fault. It inserts the word "equally" before the word "true" in the final sentence of this citation, despite the fact that there is no corresponding word in the original Latin text of the *Pascendi.*[15]

The error which St. Pius X was exposing and condemning in this particular context is that of indifferentism. This is the inaccurate teaching according to which all existing religions are true. The statement that all religions are equally true is simply an extreme form of indifferentism, one which could only be seriously brought forward by some individual who had no preference for and no affiliation with any religious society or movement whatsover. Quite obviously no man could hold such a tenet and even pretend to be a Catholic.

[13] *CICF,* III, 697; *All Things for Christ,* pp. 97 f. The first of the two paragraphs in the citation is contained in *Denz.,* n. 2082. For some reason the second paragraph is omitted.

[14] *Denz.,* 2083; *CICF,* III, 697 f.

[15] The faulty translation is in *All Things for Christ,* p. 98. The original text of this last sentence reads: "Ex quo inferre denuo licebit: religiones omnes quotquot exstant veras esse, nam secus nec viverent."

On the other hand many of the Modernists against whom St. Pius X directed his encyclical letter were actually members of the Church. As such they clearly expressed at least some preference for Catholicism, even in the line of religious truth.[16] They did, however, hold and profess the error of indifferentism. They claimed that all existing religions were in some way true. This error, which was actually being held and taught in Catholic circles, was the evil pointed out and condemned in the *Pascendi dominici gregis*. It is not too much to say that this particular teaching was the most obvious and the most widespread of all the characteristically Modernist tenets.

The section of the *Pascendi* dealing with the Modernist as a believer ends with a description of the way in which these heretics subordinate the faith to what they regard as science, and with the description of the calculated obscurity of their writings. St. Pius X ascribes this method, characteristic of the Modernists from the beginning, to the influence of their teachings on faith and science.

> In their writings and addresses they seem not unfrequently to advocate doctrines which are contrary one to the other, so that one would be disposed to regard their attitude as double or doubtful. But this is done deliberately and advisedly, and the reason of it is to be found in their opinion as to the mutual separation of science and faith. Thus in their books one finds some things which might well be approved by a Catholic, but, on turning over the page, one is confronted by other things which might well have been dictated by a rationalist.[17]

St. Pius X then goes on to show how Modernistic thought is applied in the fields of theology, history, criticism, and apologetics, and the way in which the purveyors of these errors work for the reform of the Church. He shows that their teaching is always directed by the principles enunciated and proposed by the Modernist in philosophy. Thus, for example:

> The Church and the sacraments, according to the Modernists, are not to be regarded as having been instituted by Christ Himself. This is barred by agnosticism, which recognizes in Christ nothing more than

---

[16] This was true even of Von Hügel. Cf. *Letters from Baron Friedrich Von Hügel to a Niece* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1955), p. 180.

[17] *Denz.*, 2086; *CICF*, III, 699; *All Things for Christ*, p. 100.

a man whose religious consciousness has been, like that of all men, formed by degrees; it is also barred by the law of immanence, which rejects what they call external application; it is further barred by the law of evolution, which requires, for the development of things which are going to evolve, time and a certain series of circumstances; it is finally barred by history, which shows that such in fact has been the course of things. Still it is to be held that both Church and sacraments have been established *mediately* by Christ. But how? In his way: All Christian consciences were, they affirm, in a manner virtually included in the conscience of Christ as the plant is included in the seed. But, as the branches live the life of the seed, so, too, all Christians are to be said to live the life of Christ. But the life of Christ, according to faith, is divine, and so, too, is the life of Christians. And if this life produced, in the course of ages, both the Church and the sacraments, it is quite right to say that their origin is from Christ and is divine. In the same way they make out that the Holy Scriptures and the dogmas are divine. And in this, the Modernist theology may be said to reach its completion.[18]

In the areas of history, of biblical criticism, of apologetics, and of ecclesiastical reform, the Modernists proceeded along these same lines. They desired above all things to remain in the Church as its members precisely in order that they might bring over the Church to their own way of thinking. They were anxious to retain the dogmatic formulae of the Church as long as they could interpret these statements in a way distinct from what the Church itself had always understood them to mean. They wanted the Church itself transformed into their own image, and they were willing to defy the ecclesiastical authority itself in order to attain the goal they had set for themselves.

And thus they go their way, reprimands and condemnations notwithstanding, masking an incredible audacity under a mock semblance of humility. While they make a pretence of bowing their heads, their minds and hands are more boldly intent than ever on carrying out their purposes. And this policy they follow willingly and wittingly, both because it is part of their system that authority is to be stimulated but not dethroned, and because it is necessary for them to remain within the ranks of the Church in order that they may gradually transform the collective conscience. And, in saying this, they fail to perceive that

---

[18] *Denz.*, 2088; *CICF*, III, 700 f.; *All Things for Christ*, p. 102.

they are avowing that the collective conscience is not with them, and that they have no right to claim to be its interpreters.[19]

Under the guise of history and criticism the Modernists, according to the *Pascendi,* teach that Our Lord is not truly divine.

For the Modernists distinguished very carefully between these two kinds of history [real history and what they called internal history], and it is to be noted that they oppose the history of the faith to *real* history precisely as real. Thus, as We have already said, we have a twofold Christ: a real Christ and a Christ of faith who never really existed; a Christ who has lived at a given time and in a given place, and a Christ who never lived outside the pious meditations of the believer—the Christ, for instance, whom we find in the Gospel of St. John, which, according to them, is a mere meditation from beginning to end.[20]

In the area of apologetics the Modernists spoiled their attempts to defend the Church and its teaching by intruding into that defense the poisonous principles of the Modernistic philosophy. And these people wanted to reform the Church in such a way as to bring this society into line with their own system of thought.

The *Pascendi* sees the bond of unity in the teachings of the Modernists as something powerful enough to constitute those doctrines as the synthesis of all heresies, the *omnium haereseon collectum.* It recognizes as the immediate moral sources of these errors the vices of false curiosity and pride in the men who taught and defended them. And it likewise teaches that the Modernists have fallen into their error, in great measure, because of their profound ignorance of the true philosophy.

Finally, in bringing the doctrinal part of the *Pascendi dominici gregis* to a close, St. Pius X was realistic enough to take cognizance of the principal factor in the method used by the Modernists in propagating their errors.

Finally, the Modernists try in every way to diminish and weaken the authority of the ecclesiastical magisterium itself by sacrilegiously falsifying its origin, character, and rights, and by freely repeating the

---

[19] *Denz.,* 2095; *CICF,* III, 706; *All Things for Christ,* pp. 108 f.
[20] *Denz.,* 2097; *CICF,* III, 708; *All Things for Christ,* p. 111.

calumnies of its adversaries. To the entire band of Modernists may be applied those words which Our Predecessor sorrowfully wrote: "To bring contempt and odium on the mystic Spouse of Christ, who is the true light, the children of darkness have been wont to cast in her face before the world a stupid calumny, and, perverting the meaning and force of things and of words, to depict her as the friend of darkness and of ignorance, and the enemy of light, science, and progress."[21] This being so, Venerable Brethren, there is little reason to wonder that the Modernists vent all their bitterness and hatred on Catholics who zealously fight the battles of the Church. There is no species of insult which they do not heap upon them, but their usual course is to charge them with ignorance or obstinacy. When an adversary rises up against them with an erudition and force that renders him redoubtable, they set up a conspiracy of silence against him to nullify his attacks. This policy against Catholics is the more invidious in that they perpetually praise the writers who agree with them, receiving the books of these men, books manifesting novelties on every page, with enthusiastic approval. For them the scholarship of a writer is in direct proportion to the recklessness of his attacks on antiquity, and of his efforts to undermine tradition and the ecclesiastical magisterium. When one of their number falls under the condemnations of the Church, the rest of them, to the disgust of good Catholics, gather around him, applaud him loudly and publicly, and hold him up for veneration as almost a martyr for truth. The young, excited and confused by all this clamor of praise and blame, some of them afraid of being branded as ignorant, others ambitious to rank among the learned, and both classes goaded internally by curiosity and pride, not infrequently surrender and give themselves up to Modernism.[22]

Such, in its broadest outline, is the picture of the Modernist presented in the encyclical *Pascendi dominici gregis.* St. Pius X represented the Modernist as a Catholic intellectual who, laboring under the delusion that Catholic dogma was at variance with truths discovered and taught scientifically in comparatively recent times, and imagining that the norm of secular science is superior to that of divine faith, refused to accept the dogmas of the Church with the assent of divine faith. Anxious to keep up with contemporary fads and fashions in the intellectual world, the Modernist duly accepted the principles of agnosticism and convinced himself that

[21] The citation is from the motu proprio *Ut mysticum,* issued by Pope Leo XIII on March 14, 1891.

[22] *CICF,* III, 717; *All Things for Christ,* pp. 121 f.

nothing could really be known with certainty about God. He likewise fell in with the then prevailing subjectivistic tendencies, and attempted to explain the Church, its teachings, and its worship, in terms of man's need of religion and of his experience in this area.

In all the departments of Christian thought, the Modernist introduced systematic explanations consonant with his own basic philosophical principles. He repudiated the traditional procedures employed in Catholic theology and apologetics before his time. The actual standard to which he wished his writings, and all the writings of the Church to conform, was the teaching judged fashionable during the first days of this century.

In the *Pascendi dominici gregis* St. Pius X pointed to the force of the movement sustained by these Modernists. As early as 1907 he took cognizance of the enthusiastic acclaim they gave to each other's writings, and lamented the animosity they manifested towards the real defenders of Catholic truth. He noticed the conspiracy of silence against some anti-Modernist writers, and the venomous personal attacks directed against others.

Did the *Pascendi* destroy the heresy of Modernism? In one way, of course, it did. Francis Sylvius, the greatest of the Douai theologians, one wrote that Our Lady is truly said to have destroyed all heresies "because she has shown all heresies to be false, and thus she has destroyed them in the same way that a true proposition, once it has been demonstrated, is said to have destroyed the false proposition contradictory to itself, even when that false proposition does not cease to exist and even when men are found to hold and teach this false proposition."[23] The *Pascendi dominici gregis* may be said to have destroyed the heresy of Modernism in this definite way. In this encyclical the supreme teacher of the visible Church, the Vicar of Christ on earth, authoritatively exposed the tenets of the Modernists for what they were: the contradiction of the divine message taught within the Mystical Body of Christ.

It would be silly, however, to imagine that the Modernist leaders and their sympathizers were, as a group, won over to the cause of truth by reason of the publication of the *Pascendi.* In his encyclical St. Pius X held out little hope for the conversion of these indi-

[23] Sylvius, *Opera omnia* (Antwerp, 1698), V, 112.

viduals. The *Praestantia Scripturae Sacrae* and the *Sacrorum antistitum* complained that these same persons were still working from within the Catholic Church for the destruction of true Catholic doctrine. That same complaint is repeated in the inaugural encyclical of Pope Benedict XV, the *Ad beatissimi,* written more than seven years after the *Pascendi.*[24]

The tactics used by the Modernists against their Catholic opponents have certainly continued through the years. Writers who detected and exposed the blunders of the Modernists remain virtually unknown to the students of this generation. Only a little more than two years ago the magazine *Chronique sociale de France* carried a pseudonymous article bitterly and venomously attacking the memory of Monsignor Benigni.[25] Oddly enough, an American Catholic magazine later carried an article containing much of this same defamatory material.

Are doctrines condemned in the *Pascendi* still being proposed in Catholic circles? The question, very frankly, is not easy to answer. There are still writers who seem inexorably to lead to the inference that all existent religions are good. There are others who speak of "vital religious experience" obtainable within or apart from the true Church. Others again are or seem to be quite disdainful with respect to the apologetical process outlined in the Vatican Council's constitution *Dei Filius.* And certainly some of the deficiencies of the "new theology" reproved in the encyclical *Humani generis* bear a remarkable resemblance to teachings proscribed by St. Pius X in the *Pascendi.*

At any rate the *Pascendi* must be read and studied with special attention if we are to gain a proper appreciation of some of the teachings set forth in our time. The interest and the importance of this great encyclical letter are definitely more than merely historical.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[24] Cf. *CICF,* III, 842.

[25] This strange essay was entitled "'La Sapinière' ou brève histoire de l'organisation intégriste." It was signed by a "Louis Davallon." It appeared in the May 15, 1955, issue of *Chronique sociale de France.*

Answers to Questions

THE PROXIMATE MATTER OF BAPTISM

Question: I have been told that a certain priest baptizes in this manner: He simply dips his thumb into the baptismal water and traces the sign of the cross three times on the forehead of the recipient, while he says the words of the form. What is to be said of this method of baptizing?

Answer: It seems so incredible that any priest could undertake such a procedure that I would say, in the first place, that I hope the information given to our questioner was incorrect. Certainly, the method of baptizing described in the question constitutes a doubtful administration of the sacrament of Baptism, as decisions of the Church indicate (Cf. Cappello, *De sacramentis,* I, n. 122). For the certain administration of this important sacrament the water must *flow* over the head of the recipient, and any priest who would substitute a doubtful method of baptizing, such as our questioner describes, would be guilty of grave sin.

THE NUN'S SPECIAL CONFESSOR

Question: A nun has been going to confession to a priest who was appointed by the local Ordinary as her special confessor, according to Canon 520, § 2. Recently the diocese has been divided in such a way that the nun's convent is in a different diocese from the parish in which the special confessor is stationed, and where she is accustomed to confess to him. Presuming that the nun wishes to continue to have him as her confessor, from which Bishop should he receive faculties to function as her special confessor?

Answer: The priest, as special confessor, must receive his faculties from the Bishop of the diocese in which the confession of the nun is heard—that is, from the local Ordinary. For, even when the nun resides in another diocese, she becomes the subject of the

Ordinary of the place in which she goes to confession, as far as sacramental jurisdiction is concerned, when she approaches the sacrament of Penance. A similar case would occur if a nun is visiting a convent of her institute in another diocese and goes to confession to the ordinary confessor of the convent. She would receive absolution by virtue of the faculties that the ordinary confessor possesses from the local Ordinary. However, in the case presented by the questioner another factor must be considered—the fact that the nun is subject to her own Bishop in respect to the choice of her regular spiritual guide, so that she must receive the Bishop's permission to have a regular confessor distinct from the ordinary confessor assigned to her convent (Can. 520, § 2). Hence, in order to have this particular priest as her special confessor licitly, the authorization of her own Bishop is needed.

If the priest goes from his own diocese into that of the nun to hear her confession, he must receive the necessary jurisdiction from the Bishop of this diocese.

AN ITEM OF PREMARITAL ADVICE

Question: In the course of my ministry I have encountered several cases of this kind: After some years of married life a young couple who is anxious to have children, but have not been blessed in this manner seek medical advice and assistance. The doctor (sometimes, unfortunately, a Catholic doctor) asks for a specimen of the husband's sperm, suggesting masturbation as the means to obtain it. The young man, apparently unaware that this is a grave violation of God's law, follows the suggestion. Now, in view of the fact that this is probably a frequent occurrence, do you believe it would be advisable for the priest in the premarital instruction to inform the young couple that in the event of a medical examination for sterility it is never lawful to procure semen in this manner?

Answer: I agree fully with the general idea expressed by the questioner—namely, that in the premarital instruction it would be commendable for the priest to tell the couple that under no circumstances—even at the request of a doctor for the purpose of examination or treatment—is it lawful for a married person to per-

form the complete sexual act except on the occasion of marital intercourse. I believe that this would be sufficiently definite, though it might be well to give the added advice that if any further guidance is needed in this matter at some future time, the couple should consult a priest. It is an unfortunate fact, as the questioner asserts, that sometimes a Catholic doctor will suggest masturbation as a means for procuring semen for examination, unaware apparently that this procedure was explicitly condemned by the Holy Office on August 2, 1929 (cf. *Denz.*, 2201).

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

COMMUNION FOR THE SERVER

Question: I live in a Religious Community in which most of the Masses are said on side altars with only the priest and the server receiving communion. Problems arise when the small host is placed on the altar later than it should be or is included in the offertory on the mistaken assumption that the server is going to communicate. What are the principles governing these situations?

Answer: First of all, it is helpful to remember that it is rubrically permissible and symbolically fitting for the celebrant to break off a piece of the large host for the server's communion. However, since even a vestigal offertory procession is helpful for a fuller participation in the liturgy, the server, often a future priest, will benefit by placing the host on the paten himself.

A problem arises if, due to forgetfulness, the host is not placed on the paten in time for the offertory. For a reasonable cause, it can be placed there before the Preface, though only a grave reason would justify its being placed there after the Canon has begun. In both of these situations, the offering must be supplied, mentally, at least. The problem is crucial only when the number to receive makes a sharing of the large host impossible.

Sometimes after offering up the small host, the priest finds that the server is not to receive. He should then put the host outside the corporal and consume it after he has received the Body and

the Blood, for it has been set apart as an oblation in that Mass and should not simply be put aside.

If after the consecration, it is discovered that the server will not receive, the celebrant himself should, as the rubrics specify, consume the small host.

KISSING OF SACRED OBJECTS AT A REQUIEM MASS

Question: Could you tell me just how many of the liturgical kisses are left out of a *requiem* Mass?

Answer: Those interested in symbolism can consider the omission of these liturgical kisses as a reminder of the fact of death. Actually, on anlysis, we find that in this ceremony which is the Sacrament of the Bread of Life, the omission is reduced to a minimum.

In the low Mass, the only omission is at the end of the Gospel, for the book is not kissed nor is the *Per evangelica dicta* said. Sometimes there is confusion after the *Placeat* since one does not make a full turn away from the altar as one would if the blessing were given. Nevertheless, the altar should be kissed as a mark of reverence proximate to departure.

At the solemn Mass of *Requiem,* there is no kissing of objects, such as the spoon for incense or the thurible, but this rule does not include the vestments which are kissed as usual.

THE FORM OF THE CIBORIUM

Question: While offering holy Mass for a small group of sisters, I was surprised to find in use a very odd looking ciborium. It was built like a deep paten with a broad lip around it for convenience in holding. It rested on four small legs. I found it very easy to use and very helpful, especially since the sisters wanted the hosts to be consecrated at the Mass at which they received. Although it is unconventional, is it liturgically proper?

Answer: The traditional form of the ciborium is that of a chalice with a tightly fitting cover. Though usually the most satisfactory

form, it is not the only one permitted. The one mentioned in the question, a modified paten, seems to be most useful when only a few hosts—but more than would fit on the paten—are to be consecrated. Of course, the vessel must be made of a "solid and becoming material," which is usually gold or silver; and the inside must always be gilded.

DAVID GRANFIELD, O.S.B.

Analecta

For our Analecta section this month, we have translations of two recent letters issued by the Sovereign Pontiff. The first of these documents is the encyclical on the Lourdes pilgrimage. The second letter is addressed to Archbishop Montini of Milan, and was written on the occasion of the hundredth anniversary of the birth of Pope Pius XI. We are indebted to the News Bureau of the National Catholic Welfare Conference for permission to use their translations.

THE TRANSLATION OF THE ENCYCLICAL

To Our beloved sons, Achille Cardinal Lienart, Bishop of Lille; Pierre Cardinal Gerlier, Archbishop of Lyon; Clement Cardinal Roques, Archbishop of Rennes; Maurice Cardinal Feltin, Archbishop of Paris; Georges Cardinal Grente, Archbishop-Bishop of Le Mans, and to all Our venerable brothers, the Archbishops and Bishops of France in peace and communion with the Apostolic See.

Most beloved sons and venerable brethren, greetings and apostolic benedictions:

The Lourdes pilgrimage, which We had the pleasure of making when We went to preside in the name of Our predecessor Pius XI at the Eucharistic and Marian celebrations closing the Jubilee of the Redemption, left in Our soul deep and sweet memories.

It is therefore particularly agreeable to Us to learn that, on the initiative of the Bishop of Tarbes and Lourdes, the Marian city is getting ready to celebrate with fitting splendor the centenary of the apparitions of the Immaculate Virgin at the Massabielle grotto, and that an international committee has even been constituted for this purpose under the presidency of the Most Eminent Cardinal Eugene Tisserant, Dean of the Sacred College.

We wish to join you, beloved sons and venerable brethren, in thanking God for the signal favor granted to your country, and for so many graces lavished on the multitude of pilgrims during the past century.

We wish also to invite all Our sons to renew, in this jubilee year, their confident and generous piety toward her who, according to the words of St. Pius X, deigned to establish at Lourdes "the seat of her immense kindness" (Letter, July 12, 1914, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* VI, 1914, p. 376).

Every Christian land is a Marian land, and there is no people who have been redeemed in the blood of Christ who do not like to proclaim Mary as their Mother and their Patron.

This truth stands out in bold relief when one recalls the history of France. The cult of the Mother of God dates back to the origins of that country's evangelization. Among the most ancient of Marian shrines, Chartres still attracts a great number of pilgrims and thousands of young people.

The Middle Ages which sang the glory of Mary and her mysteries, especially with St. Bernard, saw the marvelous flowering of your cathedrals dedicated to Our Lady: Le Puy, Rheims, Amiens, Paris and so many others.

They announce from afar with their slender spires this glory of the Immaculate. They make it shine in the pure light of their stained glass windows and the harmonious beauty of their statues.

They bear witness especially to the faith of a people who raised themselves in one magnificent impulse to erect in the sky of France the permanent homage of their Marian piety.

In cities and in the country, on the tops of hills or dominating the sea, sanctuaries consecrated to Mary—humble chapels or magnificent basilicas—covered the country little by little with their protective shadow.

Princes and shepherds, numberless faithful have come to these shrines throughout the centuries to the holy Virgin, whom they have saluted with the most expressive titles of their confidence or of their gratitude. Here Notre Dame de Misericorde (Our Lady of Mercy), Toute Aide (All Help), Bon Secours (Good Help) is evoked; there, the pilgrim seeks refuge near Notre Dame de la Garde (Our Lady of Care), de Pitie (of Pity), and de Consolation (of Consolation). Elsewhere, the pilgrim's prayer rises to Notre Dame de Lumiere (Our Lady of Light), de Paix (of Peace), de Joie (of Joy) or d'Esperance (of Hope); or again to implore the intercession of Notre Dame des Vertus (Our Lady of Virtues), des Miracles (of Miracles), or des Victoires (of Vic-

tories). It is an admirable litany of invocations, the never-ending enumeration of which tells, from province to province, the benefits which the Mother of God lavished on the land of France throughout the ages.

The nineteenth century was to become, after the storm of the Revolution, in many ways the century of Marian favors.

To mention only one fact, who has not today heard of the Miraculous Medal? Revealed in the very heart of the French capital to a humble daughter of St. Vincent de Paul whom We had the joy to inscribe in the catalogue of saints, this medal which bears the effigy of "Mary conceived without sin" has spread its spiritual and material wonders everywhere.

A few years later, from February 11 to July 16, 1858, it pleased the Blessed Virgin Mary, as a new favor, to manifest herself in the land of the Pyrenees to a pious and pure child born of a poor, hard-working, Christian family.

"She came to Bernadette," We once said, "she made her her confidante, the collaboratrix, the instrument of her maternal tenderness and of the merciful power of her Son, to restore the world in Christ through a new and incomparable effusion of the redemption." (Discourse, April 28, 1935, at Lourdes: Eugenio Cardinal Pacelli, "Discourses and Panegyrics," 2d ed. Vatican, 1956, p. 435.)

The events which then took place at Lourdes, the spiritual proportions of which one measures better today, are well known to you.

You know, beloved sons and venerable brethren, under what astonishing conditions the voice of that child, the messenger of the Immaculate, imposed itself on the world in spite of ridicule, doubt and opposition.

You know steadfastness and purity of the testimony, which the episcopal authority judged with wisdom and passed upon as early as 1862.

Even then crowds flocked to the sanctuary, and they have not ceased to surge into the grotto of the apparitions toward the miraculous spring and the shrine erected at Mary's request.

It is the moving cortege of the humble, the sick and the afflicted.

It is the impressive pilgrimage of thousands of faithful from one diocese or one nation. It is the discreet supplication of a troubled soul seeking truth.

"Never," We once said, "has one seen such a procession of suffering in one spot on earth, never such a radiance of peace, serenity and joy!" (*ibid.*, p. 437).

Never, We might add, will one know the total of the benefits which the world owes to the helping Virgin! "O specus felix, decorate divae Matris aspectu! Veneranda rupes, unde vitales scatuere pleno gurgite lymphae!" (O honored cave, by Mary's smile adorned! O hallowed rock, whence spring the living waters of a gushing stream! [Office of the feast of the apparitions of Our Lady of Lourdes, hymn of II vespers.])

These one hundred years of Marian cult, furthermore, have in some manner woven close bonds between the See of Peter and the Shrine of the Pyrenees, which it please Us to recognize.

Did the Virgin Mary herself desire this bond? "That which in Rome through his infallible magisterium the Sovereign Pontiff defined, the Immaculate Virgin Mother of God, blessed among all women, wanted to confirm by her own mouth, it seems, when shortly afterward she manifested herself by a famous apparition at the grotto of Massabielle . . ." (Decree "De Tuto" for the canonization of St. Bernadette, July 2, 1933, *AAS*, XXV [1933], 377).

Certainly the infallible word of the Roman Pontiff, the authentic interpreter of revealed truth, needed no heavenly confirmation to impose itself upon the belief of the faithful. But with what emotion and gratitude did the Christian people and its pastors receive from the lips of Bernadette this answer which came from heaven: "I am the Immaculate Conception."

It is therefore not surprising that it should have pleased Our predecessors to multiply their favor toward this sanctuary.

As early as 1869, Pius IX of holy memory rejoiced that the obstacles created against Lourdes by the malice of men "rendered the more strong and evident the clarity of the fact" (Letter, Sept. 4, 1869, to Henri Lasserre: Vatican Secret Archives, latin letters, 1869, no. 388, p. 695).

And, strengthened by this assurance, he lavished spiritual benefits upon the newly erected church and crowned the statue of Our Lady of Lourdes.

Leo XIII in 1892 granted the Proper Office and the Mass of the feast "The Apparitions of the Blessed Virgin Mary Immaculate" which his successor was a short time later to extend to the universal Church.

The ancient appeal of the Scriptures was from that time on to have a new application: "Arise, my beloved, my beautiful one, and come: O my dove in the clefts of the rock, in the secret recesses of the cliff . . ." (*Cant.* 2:13 f. [Gradual of the Mass of the feast of the Apparitions]).

Toward the end of his life, the great pontiff wanted to inaugurate and bless the reproduction of the grotto of Massabielle in the Vatican gardens, and in those same days his voice rose to the Virgin of Lourdes in an ardent and trusting prayer:

"May it be that in her power the Virgin Mother, who once cooperated through her love with the birth of the faithful in the Church, may she now return the tranquility of peace to troubled souls; may she hasten, finally, the return of Jesus Christ in private and public life" (Brief, Sept. 8, 1901: *Acts of Leo XIII,* XXI, 159 f.).

The fifteenth anniversary of the definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Holy Virgin gave St. Pius X occasion to bear witness in a solemn document to the historic connection between this act of the teaching authority of the Church and the apparitions of Lourdes:

"Pius IX had hardly defined it to be of Catholic Faith that Mary was from her very origin exempt from sin, when the Virgin herself began operating wonders at Lourdes" (Ency. Letter *Ad diem illum,* Jubilee of the Immaculate Conception, Feb. 2, 1904: *Acts of Pius X,* I, 149).

Soon afterward he created the episcopal title of Lourdes, attached it to that of Tarbes, and signed the introduction of the cause for the beatification of Bernadette.

It was especially reserved to this great Pope of the Eucharist to underline and favor the admirable conjunction which exists in Lourdes between the Eucharistic cult and Marian intercession.

"Piety toward the Mother of God," he noted, "was the source of the flowering there of a remarkable and ardent piety toward Christ Our Lord" (Letter, July 12, 1914: *AAS,* VI [1914], 377).

Could it have been otherwise?

Everything in Mary carries us to her Son, our only Savior, in anticipation of Whose merits she was immaculate and full of grace.

Everything in Mary raises us to the praise of the adorable Trinity.

And so it was that Bernadette, praying her rosary before the grotto, learned from the lips and expression of the Holy Virgin how she should give glory to the Father, Son and Holy Ghost!

We are happy in this centenary to associate Ourselves with this homage rendered by St. Pius X:

"The unique glory of the sanctuary of Lourdes resides in this fact, that peoples are attracted there from everywhere by Mary for the adoration of Jesus Christ in the august sacrament, so that this sanctuary—at the same time the center of Marian cult and the throne of the eucharistic mystery—surpasses in glory all others in the Catholic world, it seems" (Brief, Apr. 25, 1911; Arch. Brev. Ap., Pius X, 1911; Div. Lib. IX, part I, p. 337).

Benedict XV wanted to enrich this sanctuary, already heaped with favors, with new and precious indulgence and, if the tragic circumstances of his pontificate did not allow him to multiply the public acts of his devotion, he nevertheless wanted to honor the Marian city by granting to its bishop the privilege of the pallium at the place of the apparitions.

Pius XI, who had been to Lourdes himself as a pilgrim, continued the work of Benedict XV. He had the joy of raising to the altars the girl favored by the Virgin and who, in the habit of the Congregation of Charity and Christian Instruction, had become Sister Marie Bernard.

Did he not in turn verify, in a way, the premise made by the Immaculate to young Bernadette that she would "be happy not in this world, but in the next?"

From that time on, Nevers, which takes pride in keeping the precious relics of Bernadette, has attracted a great number of the Lourdes pilgrims who have wanted to learn from her how to receive in the proper manner the message of our day.

Soon the illustrious Pontiff, like his predecessors who had honored the anniversary celebrations of the apparitions by sending a

legate, decided to close the Jubilee of the Redemption at the Grotto of Massabielle where, in his own words, "the Immaculate Virgin Mary showed herself several times to Blessed Bernadette Soubirous, and where with kindness she exhorted all men to do penance in this very place of the wondrous apparitions upon which she heaped graces and wonders" (Brief, Jan. 11, 1933; Arch. Brev. Ap., Pius XI, Ind. Perpet., p. 128).

In truth, Pius XI concluded, this sanctuary "is now justly considered one of the principal Marian sanctuaries of the world" (*id.*).

How could We have refrained from adding Our voice to this unanimous concert of praise?

We did so notably in Our Encyclical *Fulgens Corona* (Marian Year) by recalling, after Our predecessors, that "the Blessed Virgin Mary herself wanted to confirm through a prodigy, it seems, the pronouncement which the Vicar on earth of her Divine Son had just proclaimed with the applause of the entire Church" (Ency. Letter *Fulgens Corona,* Sept. 8, 1953; *AAS,* XLV [1953], 578).

On that occasion We recalled how the Roman Pontiffs, conscious of the importance of this pilgrimage, had never ceased to "enrich it with spiritual favors and with the benefits of their benevolence."

Is not the history of the past hundred years, which We have recalled rather broadly, a constant illustration of this pontifical benevolence, the last act of which was the closing at Lourdes of the centenary year of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception?

But We would like especially to recall to you, beloved sons and venerable brethren, a recent document with which We favored the growth of a missionary apostolate in your beloved country.

In it We had in mind to evoke the "singular merits which France has acquired throughout the centuries in the progress of the Catholic faith" and for this reason "We turned Our mind and Our heart toward Lourdes where, four years after the definition of the dogma, the Immaculate Virgin herself gave supernatural confirmation to the declaration of the Supreme Teacher through apparitions, conversations and miracles" (Apostolic Constitution *Omnium Ecclesiarum,* the Mission of France, Aug. 15, 1954: *AAS,* XLVI [1954], 567).

Today again We turn toward the famous sanctuary which is now preparing to receive the crowds of centenary pilgrims on the shores of the river Gave.

If in the past century ardent public and private supplications have obtained there so many graces of healing and conversion from God through the intercession of Mary, We are firmly confident that in this jubilee year Our Lady will want to respond again with liberality to the expectations of her children.

But We are especially convinced that she urges Us to recall the spiritual lessons of the apparitions and set them upon the path which she so clearly traced for us.

* * * * *

These lessons, the faithful echo of the teachings of the Gospel message, throw particular light on the contrasts which oppose the judgment of God to the vain wisdom of this world.

In a society, barely conscious of the ills which assail it, which conceals its miseries and injustices under an outward appearance of bright and carefree prosperity, the Immaculate Virgin, never touched by sin, showed herself to an innocent child.

With maternal compassion she looks upon this world which has been redeemed by the blood of her Divine Son, but in which sin sows so much ruin. And on three occasions she made her urgent appeal: "Penance, penance, penance!"

She even appealed for outward manifestations: "Go and kiss the earth in penance for sinners."

And to this gesture must be added a prayer: "You must pray to God for sinners."

This same injunction was made in the time of John the Baptist, and at the beginning of Jesus' ministry, showing men the way to return to God: "Repent!" (*Matt.* 3:2; 4:17). And who would dare say that this appeal for the conversion of hearts is not applicable to our times?

But how could the Mother of God come to her children except as the messenger of forgiveness and hope?

The water already flows from beneath her feet: "Omnes sitientes, venite ad aquas, et haurietis salutem a Domino (All ye who thirst, come to the waters and ye shall draw salvation from the Lord." Office of the feast of the Apparitions of Our Lady at Lourdes, III Nocturn).

At this spring, where gentle Bernadette was the first to go and drink and wash, there will flow away all the miseries of the soul and body. "And I went and washed and I see" (*John* 9:11), the blind of the Gospel and the grateful pilgrim will be able to respond.

But, as it was with the crowds which pressed around Jesus, the healing of physical wounds remains as a gesture of mercy and a sign of that power which the Son of Man has to remit sins (Cf. *Mark* 2:10).

The Virgin invites us to the blessed grotto on behalf of her Divine Son, for the conversion of the heart and in hope of pardon.

Will we heed her?

In this humble response of man who admits himself to be a sinner there resides the true greatness of this jubilee year.

The Church would have a right to expect great good, if each pilgrim to Lourdes—and even all Christians united in heart with the centenary celebrations—realized in the first place this action of sanctification within himself "not in word, neither with the tongue, but in deed and in truth" (*I John* 3:18).

There is everything to invite the Christian to this action of sanctification, for nowhere except, perhaps, at Lourdes does one feel so moved to prayer, to the forgetting of oneself and to charity.

For instance, the sight of the stretcher-bearers and the serene peace of the invalids; of the fraternity which assembles faithful of all origins in one single invocation; the sight of the spontaneity of helping each other and the fervor with which without affectation the pilgrims kneel in front of the grotto.

At seeing all these things, the best persons are compelled by the attraction of a life more completely dedicated to the service of God and to their brothers; the less fervent become conscious of their lukewarmness and once again return to the road of prayer; the more hardened and incredulous sinners themselves are often touched by grace, or at least if they are honest, do not remain unmoved by the testimony of this "multitude of believers with only one heart and one soul" (*Acts* 4:32).

But this experience of a few brief days of pilgrimage does not in itself generally suffice to engrave in indelible letters the appeal of Mary for a genuine spiritual conversion.

And We exhort you, the pastors of dioceses and all the priests, to a rivalry of zeal so that the pilgrims of the centenary may benefit by a preparation, for a realization and above all for a future as conducive as possible to a profound and lasting action of grace.

A return to a diligent frequenting of the sacraments, to the respect of Christian morals in everyday life, and the rallying to the ranks of Catholic Action and to the various institutions recommended by the Church: only on these conditions, is it not true that the important affluence of crowds expected at Lourdes in 1958 can yield, according to the expectations of the Immaculate Virgin herself, the fruits of salvation so necessary to mankind today.

But, whatever preeminent importance may be given to the conversion of the individual pilgrim, it would not suffice.

We exhort you in this jubilee year, beloved sons and venerable brethren, to inspire the faithful committed to your care to make a collective effort of Christian renewal of society in answer to the appeal of Mary: "May blind spirits . . . be illumined by the light of truth and justice," Pius XI asked at the time of the Marian feasts of the Jubilee of the Redemption, "so that those who have gone astray in error might be brought back to the right path, that a just liberty be granted everywhere to the Church, and that an era of accord and true prosperity might rise over all nations" (Letter, Jan. 10, 1935; *AAS*, XXVII, 7).

The world, which in our days offers so many legitimate motives for pride and security, knows also nowadays a terrible temptation to materialism, often denounced by Our predecessors and Ourselves.

This materialism is not to be found only in the condemned philosophy which rules the politics and economic life of a segment of humanity.

It rages also in the love of money, the ruin of which increases according to the dimensions of modern enterprises, and which unfortunately determines so many decisions which weigh on the life of the people.

It expresses itself in the cult of the body, in the excessive search for comforts and the flight from all the austerities of life.

It prompts one to despise human life, the life itself which is destroyed before it is able to see the light of day.

It resides in the unrestrained search for pleasure which exhibits itself without modesty and even attempts to seduce souls which are still pure with reading matter and entertainments.

It shows itself in the lack of interest of one's brother, in the selfishness which crushes man with injustice and deprives him of his rights, in a word, in that concept of life which regulates all things only in terms of material prosperity and earthly satisfactions.

" 'And I will say to my soul,' the rich man said, 'Soul, thou hast many good things laid up for many years; take thy ease, eat, drink, be merry.' But God said to him, 'Thou fool, this night do they demand thy soul of thee' " (*Luke* 12:19 f.).

To a society which in its public life often contests the supreme rights of God, which would conquer the universe at the expense of its soul (cf. *Mark* 8:36) and has hastened to its own ruin, the motherly Virgin sent out a cry of alarm.

May priests, attentive to her appeal, dare to preach the great truths of salvation without fear.

There can be no lasting renewal, in fact, unless based on the unbreakable principles of faith, and it is up to the priests to form the consciences of Christian peoples.

Just like the Immaculate who, compassionate for our miseries but foreseeing our real needs, came to men to remind them of the essential and austere steps of religious conversion, so ought the ministers of the Word of God, with supernatural assurance, trace for souls the narrow road which leads to life (*Matt.* 7:14).

They will do this without forgetting to exercise the spirit of kindness and patience which they profess (*Luke* 9:55) but without concealing anything of the demands of the Gospel.

At the school of Mary they will learn how to live only to give Christ to the world, but also, if need be, to await with faith the hour of Jesus and remain at the foot of the cross.

Assembled around their priests, the faithful must work together in this effort for renewal.

Wherever God has placed a man, is there not always more to be done for the cause of God? Our thoughts turn first of all toward the consecrated souls who, within the framework of the Church, devote themselves to innumerable good works. Their religious vows urge them more than others to fight victoriously under the

aegis of Mary against the unleashing upon the world of the unreasonable greed for independence, for riches and pleasure.

Also, in appeal to the Immaculate, they will oppose the onslaught of evil with the weapons of prayer and penance, and with victories of charity.

Our thoughts also turn to the Christian families, to seek them to remain faithful to their irreplaceable mission in society. May they consecrate themselves in this jubilee year to the Immaculate Heart of Mary!

This act of piety will constitute a precious spiritual aid for married couples in the practice of the duties of chastity and conjugal faithfulness.

It will preserve purity in the atmosphere in which the children grow up.

Far more, it will make of the family, inspired by its devotion to Mary, a living cell of social regeneration and apostolic penetration.

In addition to the family circle, professional and civic relations offer a vast field of action to Christians desirous of working for the renewal of society.

Gathered round the feet of the Virgin, docile to her exhortations, they will first of all turn a searching look upon themselves and they will seek to uproot from their conscience false judgments and selfish impulses, fearing the falsehood of a love of God which does not translate itself into effective love of their brothers (*I John* 4:20).

Christians of every class and every nation will seek to meet one another in truth and in charity, and to banish misunderstanding and suspicion. The weight of social structures and economic pressures burdening the good will of men is undoubtedly enormous and often paralyzes it.

But if it is true as Our predecessors and We Ourselves have insistently stressed, that the question of man's social and political peace is above all a moral question, no reform can be fruitful, no agreement can be stable wihout a change and purification of hearts.

The Virgin of Lourdes, in this jubilee year, recalls this to all men!

And if in this solicitude Mary looks upon certain of her children with special predilection, is it not, beloved sons and venerable brethren, toward the small, the poor and the afflicted whom Jesus loved so much?

"Come to me, all you who labor and are burdened, and I will give you rest" she seems to say together with her Divine Son (*Matt.* 11:28).

Go to her, you who are crushed by material misery, defenseless against the hardships of life and the indifference of men. Go to her, you who are in mourning and assailed by moral trials.

Go to her, beloved invalids and infirm, you who are truly welcomed and honored at Lourdes as the suffering members of Our Lord. Go to her and receive peace of heart, strength for your daily duty, the joy of sacrifice offered.

The Immaculate Virgin, who knows the secret ways of grace in souls and the silent work of the supernatural leaven in this world, knows the great price which God attaches to your sufferings united to those of the Savior.

They can greatly contribute, We have no doubt, to this Christian renewal of society which We implore of God through the powerful intercession of His Mother.

May there be added to the prayers of the sick, of the humble, of all the pilgrims to Lourdes, that prayer to Mary that she may also turn her maternal look toward those who are still outside the limits of the only fold, the Church, so that they may come together in unity. May she look upon those who seek and are thirsty for truth, and lead them to the source of living waters.

May she cast her glance upon the immense continents and their vast human areas where Christ is unfortunately so little known, so little loved; and may she obtain for the Church the freedom and joy to be able to respond everywhere, always youthful, holy and apostolic, to the expectations of men.

"Kindly come . . .," said the Virgin to Bernadette.

This discreet invitation which does not compel, which is addressed to the heart, and requests with delicacy a free and generous response, the Mother of God puts forward again to her sons of France and of the world. Christians will not remain deaf to this appeal; they will go to Mary.

And in conclusion of this letter it is to them that We wish to say together with St. Bernard: "In periculis, in angustiis, in rebus dubiis, Mariam cogita, Mariam invoca. . . . Ipsam sequens, non devias; ipsam rogans, non desperas; ipsam cogitans, non erras; ipsa tenente, non corruis; ipsa protegente, non metuis; ipsa duce, non fatigaris; ipsa propitia, pervenis. . . . (In dangers, difficulties and in doubt, think of Mary, call on Mary. . . . Follow her without swerving; call upon her with hope; think of her with confidence; with her support, you will not fall; under her protection, you may be fearless; under her leadership, be untiring; with her aid, you will persevere.)" (Hom. II on *Missus est; MPL,* CLXXXIII, 70 f.)

We are confident, dear sons and venerable brethren, that Mary will hear your prayer and Ours. We ask her this on this feast of the Visitation, which fittingly celebrates her who a century ago visited the land of France.

And, in inviting you to sing to God together with the Immaculate Virgin the Magnificat of your gratitude, We invoke upon you and your faithful, on the shrine Lourdes and its pilgrims, on all those who bear the responsibilities of the centenary celebrations, the most bounteous effusion of grace. In token of which We impart with all Our heart and with Our constant and paternal benevolence, the apostolic benediction.

Given at Rome at St. Peter's on the feast of the Visitation of the Most Holy Virgin, July 2, 1957, the nineteenth of Our pontificate.

POPE PIUS XII

* * * * *

THE TRANSLATION OF THE LETTER TO ARCHBISHOP MONTINI

The announcement of the solemn preparations which the city of Desio is making to commemorate the centenary of the birth of Pius XI is to Us a grateful invitation to speak on such a happy occasion so as to thank God for the gift granted to Christianity of a Pontiff great among the great.

History has already passed judgment in a sense by retracing the imposing material and spiritual work which filled the long pontificate of this successor of Peter.

Although until the age of 60 he had been above all an assiduous scholar of codices and manuscripts, his teachings, projects and actions showed him to be a dynamic combination of a man of action, thought and determination who, at the helm of the mystic ship, to the world's surprise steered with a lofty understanding and a clear foresight of new needs.

He lived his program in the spirit: *Pax Christi in regno Christi.*

However, that which men did not know, except perhaps as reflected in the profound words to which they paid too little attention, was the richness of his inner life.

That is where we must search for the secret of all his activity and fortitude.

We whom Providence placed at his side as humble collaborators in his daily toil knew that he was in private just what his public acts showed him to be: a man completely imbued with the dignity and mission entrusted to him by God.

And his last illness revealed the virtue of the fearless pontiff even more clearly to the world.

In spite of his request of God that his death might come not by surprise but rapidly, the illness that was to put an end to such a noble existence was long and very painful.

He manifested his evangelical fortitude: while he continued to carry on his duties, he could not refrain from showing that he was in great pain. He did not allow himself to be dejected but remained without ostentation at his post of command—as a suffering man, as a Pope at work.

He was a spectacle of pontifical greatness in simplicity and Christian humility. To God's flock he was an admirably effective teacher of that which men ought to know: how to suffer.

Entrusting to Your Excellency these Our sentiments suggested by the fitting centenary commemoration, We hope that it will be abundant in good spiritual faith. And from Our heart We impart to you, the authorities, the clergy, the promoters, and to Our beloved children of Desio and to all those taking part, Our Apostolic Blessing.

Book Reviews

PRINCIPLES OF SACRAMENTAL THEOLOGY. By Bernard Leeming, S.J. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1956. Pp. lvii+690. $6.75.

There is no secret in the fact that increasing numbers of people are acquiring a serious interest in theology. Apart from those professionally so engaged, Brothers, Nuns and not a few of the laity have enrolled in various theological institutes or classes and shown an interest far beyond the stock catechism questions and answers. While their linguistic background may prove something of a handicap, there is little room for doubt about the seriousness of their intention. For all of these this is one of the finer books on theology in the English language. The fact alone that it is in English would grant it some merit. The added fact that it is a quality product of a highly competent pen gives it a lustre shared by few theological works in this language. While it may not welcome casual reading, it promises great benefits to the serious student.

Father Leeming covers the treatise *De Sacramentis in Genere* fully, with clarity and objectivity. In the area of positive theology his efforts are especially noteworthy and indicative. Here he does not list a mere catalogue of names, dates and the briefest of quotations. Rather he is at considerable pains to present a thorough historical, theological context, and thus to allow the doctrine to emerge in the true brilliance of its setting. It would not seem unlikely that he has benefited from the work of his co-religious, Father Lennerz, S.J., in his appreciation of positive theology. And while in one volume the treatment cannot presume to be exhaustive, it is at all times clear, highly competent and open to sincere congratulations.

The scope of the work can be seen from six sections into which it is divided: The Sacraments and Grace; The Sacraments and the Character; Sacramental Causality; The Institution of the Sacraments; Requirements in the Minister; and the Sacramental Economy. Each section is multi-chaptered; each chapter is summarized in a "principle" which is fully explained in its historical, doctrinal and controversial background. The variant non-Catholic opinions are not relegated to one-sentence-remarks, but, as often as practical, are quoted from their own texts in some detail.

The book is amply annotated throughout, and is especially blessed with a comprehensive bibliography and special bibliographies for each section. It is a splendid theological text in the English language.

MERWYN F. NUXOLL

HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. By Thomas P. Neill and Raymond H. Schmandt. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1957. Pp. xx + 684. $8.75.

This impressive volume by Dr. Neil of the History Department of St. Louis University and Dr. Schmandt of the same department of De Paul University is a textbook on the history of the Catholic Church. Beginning with the foundation of the Church in the Graeco-Roman world, the authors trace its progress and growth throughout the centuries to the present era. The struggles of the infant Church in the face of persecution and heresy, the impact of the Barbarian invasions on the life of the Church, the Crusades, the Protestant revolt in the 16th century, and the status of the Church in modern times are some, but by no means all, of the subjects which are ably treated in this volume. In determining the material to be discussed the authors have followed the principle of treating those subjects which seemed important to the good minds of the period under discussion. As a result we think the student will find an excellent survey of the religious, cultural, social, and economic factors that have influenced the life of the Church in every phase of its existence.

Admittedly, a one-volume work on such a vast subject as the history of the Church cannot report all the storms and tempests through which the Bark of Peter has sailed during its voyage of twenty centuries. But the value of this book is that it presents, in compact fashion, an adequate and balanced study of the major events, the principal persons, and the outstanding issues that have furthered or halted the Church's progress during the various periods of its existence. The less edifying deeds and attitudes of individuals, so often seen by impassioned historians as "abuses in the Church," are treated with complete and admirable candor by the authors, who neither exaggerate nor minimize them, but relate them with historical objectivity. In these matters as elsewhere in the book we think the authors have achieved their avowed purpose of following the norm set down by Pope Leo XIII: "It is the first law of history that it dare not say anything which is false nor fear to utter anything that is true, in order that there may be no suspicion either of partiality or of hostility in the writer."

Certain features of this book will prove of invaluable aid to both teacher and student. The review questions at the end of each chapter will provide the teacher with pertinent material for class quizzes and also enable the student to judge whether he has mastered the subject matter of the chapter or not. Very useful, too, is the bibliography of historical works written in English which appears at the close of each chapter. Accompanying this bibliography is a short evaluation of the works listed which should serve as a guide to the teacher assigning supplementary reading and to the student desirous of further information on a particular subject. A more general and eminently useful bibliography of longer works on the history of the Church can be found at the close of the book. Comparative charts, chronologically outlining historical events and movements, appear at the close of each great period of the Church's history and furnish the student with an excellent summary and over-all view of the subjects just studied. This whole book, from the neatly planned table of contents to the detailed index, is designed to aid the student in his quest for knowledge of the Church's history.

For these reasons we recommend the reading of this volume to all interested in the history of the Catholic Church. Especially, we recommend it to seminary professors and students who, we think, will find in this volume an accurate and informative text as well as a rich and handy reference work.

KEVIN MCMORROW, S.A.

DELIVER US FROM EVIL. By Thomas A. Dooley, M.D. New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1956. Pp. 214. $3.50.

Dr. Dooley, till his recent experiences in Viet Nam, had led the rather quiet life of a student. He studied at Notre Dame University and at the Sorbonne. He studied medicine at St. Louis University, received his degree, and took his internship with the U. S. Navy. Life was peaceful, orderly; Dien Bien Phu, Indo-China were mere words. But these words soon came to enter his life. He has lived their reality, and now he asks us to share that reality translated in his book.

Deliver Us from Evil is the eye-witness account of the terrible struggle raging between communism and Christianity. In military and medical jargon and down-to-earth English the author paints the portrait of Christ crucified in Indo-China. Before the readers eyes the members of Christ's Mystical Body are called up, here in huddled masses, there in wretched loneliness. Inhuman outrages: a priest crowned with thorns

in imitation of Christ, but the thorns were nails hammered into his head; a priest hung by his feet and beaten till his flesh lost all sensitivity; a young teacher and his pupils punished for talking of God, the teacher by having his tongue cut out, the pupils by having their eardrums pierced—these are but a few indications of communist attitude and method.

Yet this is not a summary of oriental and communist horrors, nor a mere listing of morbid atrocities. It is the story of a people told by an American. People being human, and Americans more so, there is humor even in pathos, in spite of pathos.

Thus a weary doctor, soundly thwacked by a fearful, irate mother, can still smile in remembering his broken ribs and the misunderstanding that caused them. The woman, although suffering from communist propaganda, had allowed her ulcerous child to be injected with penicillin. Later, seeing the infant reacting with a case of hives, she attacked the American as a murderer. But when her child recovered from both hives and ulcers, she humbly demonstrated her repentance and gratitude by remaining in the camp to help in the work of cleansing both the minds and bodies of her fellow refugees.

Stories of children, so often the pure reflection of a nation's spirit, etch themselves deeply in one's heart. One lad gives his life as a human decoy; another, choosing to walk to freedom, suffers his feet to be smashed. The orphanage of Madame Ngai, besides its own beautiful description, offers us a view into the tender-hearted generosity of countless American seamen and the pliability of "brass" in the hands of children. And, finally, the tough little youngsters of Haiphong must be mentioned. Ranging from the age of eight years and up, entirely independent, earning their bread by shoe-shining and petty theft, loyal assistants to the American relief team, they were persuaded only at the last minute to leave the doomed city. The earth-shaking reason was the fact that in the communist zones everyone wore canvas shoes.

As a final word, I make this comment. Lieutenant Dooley has written his book with one definite purpose in mind. He desires to bring the truth of communist peace before the minds of his secure and too often indifferent fellow citizens. The value of his work rests principally upon the explicit reality it portrays and the implicit warning it extends. He presents two questions: "How did such tyranny gain control?" and "How may we prevent it from spreading or engulfing us?" His answer of course is the entire book; the key word, however, is truth. Communism flourishes in ignorance, half-truths, lies. Truth is the foundation of liberty and liberty the guarantee of truth.

JAMES A. MURPHY, S.M.